THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THERE is nothing more necessary to-day than a simple, clear and intelligible statement of what the Bible is and how the Bible is to be read. Professor T. E. JESSOP has given us such a statement in *On Reading the English Bible*.[1] Professor JESSOP is Ferens Professor of Philosophy in the University of Hull, and he is careful and modest to point out that in the sphere of Biblical knowledge he is a layman, and not a professional theologian. It may well be that it is that very fact which gives this book its freshness and its cogency.

The book is written on the presupposition that 'the Bible is the original and still fundamental document of our Faith and Way, and that it was written for ordinary people'. 'When Christians cease to demand the Bible and to pore over it, contented instead to take their faith always at second hand, the iron will go out of their blood and all strength out of their muscles'. But, although that is so, there has been a failure to work out a technique or techniques 'for showing people how to read the Bible to the profit of their whole being'.

Professor JESSOP is open-eyed to the difficulties with which the A.V. confronts the twentieth century reader. It is a volume which is not physically easy to handle or to read. How could it be otherwise when the printer has to compress 774,746 words into one volume? Although the chapter and the verse divisions may be very useful for reference purposes, they are a hindrance to the reader. The Authorised Version's use of italics reverses the normal practice. In the A.V. words in italics are never important and merely indicate that there is no definite corresponding word in the original. The punctuation of the Bible can be problematic, because the original MSS almost totally lacked punctuation. Certain problems in reading consistently arise.

Words are used in unfamiliar senses. In 2 Ch 14^{18} a *target* means a *shield*. In Ps 124^{3} 'to swallow *quick*' does not mean 'to swallow *fast*' but 'to swallow *alive*'—a fact of which not many ordinary readers of the Psalms will be aware. The word *conversation* in the A.V. can, and often does, mean *conduct in general*, a fact that is important to remember in 1 P 3^{1}! Sometimes the use of words is strange according to modern practice. In Ph 4^{8} *honest* is used in the sense of *honourable*. There are certain words which are misleading if taken in their modern sense. Such a word is the word *mansions* in Jn 14^{2}. In Ph 3^{21} the word *vile* as applied to the body means no more than *cheap*, or *worthless*. Many an eccentricity of the Christian ethic has resulted from the failure to understand that the word *thought* in Mt 6^{25} means *anxious thought* or *worry*. The Bible can sound excessively severe if we do not know that *damn* means no more than *condemn* in such passages as Ro 14^{23}.

There are Hebraisms which the intelligent reader must know something about. Hebrew does not subordinate clauses, but adds clause to clause with a series of *ands*; and Hebrew is weak in conjunctions and, therefore, the meaning of *and* is elastic; it can, for instance, often mean *but*. Hebrew is weak in adjectives and uses instead the adjectival genitive. A phrase like 'the throne of His holiness' means 'His holy throne' (Ps 47^{8}). 'The King of glory' is 'the glorious King' (Ps $24^{7,8}$). Hebrew has an individual way of expressing the superlative. The 'Song of Songs' is 'the best of songs'; the 'holy of holies' is 'the holiest place.' It is thus that the phrase 'King of kings and Lord of lords' must be interpreted.

Clearly all this makes new translations necessary. Our knowledge of the original languages has vastly increased. Far better manuscripts are at the disposal of the translators. The English language itself has altered. 'What we must shrink from doing is to claim a peculiar inspiration for *any* translation.'

How, then, are we to approach the Bible? Are there any general rules? It is a fact to remember

[1] Epworth Press; 5s. net.

that we do not approach every kind of book in the same way. In the Bible there are, for instance, stories, poems, sermons, and we will not approach them all in the same way. There are two general rules. First, 'instead of imagining how God would or should speak to us, we should take the Bible as we find it'. Second, we must not approach it supinely, but with every faculty alert. Professor JESSOP will have nothing to do with the idea that 'our natural mental equipment is so sin-sodden that we must renounce it and rely entirely on the reception of the Holy Spirit'. We must come to the Bible with every faculty alert. 'The mental approach to the Bible is not, then, to summon up a solemn feeling, put the rest of the mind aside, and take in everything as the voice of God, but to go to it with the whole of our being and respond discriminatingly to all its miscellaneous richness'.

But what, then, is the standard of 'discrimination'? The standard of discrimination is Christ. 'Any view of God that is inconsistent with Christ's character, and any allegedly divine command which Christ could not endorse, is either only very indirectly from God, or not from God at all'. When we do that, we can see that there are certain passages, like 1 S 15[3] and like the cursing psalms, which are 'human eruptions and not divine descents. They exemplify what God has to contend with—and contends with still'.

Professor JESSOP goes on to suggest three approaches to the Bible. (1) There is the *historical* approach, in which we use every aid to see what any passage meant when it was first written, or any word meant when it was first spoken. (2) There is the *personal* approach, in which we apply the discovered meaning of Scripture to ourselves—instead of applying it to other people! 'We tend to relish Christ's frequent condemnation of the Pharisees, instead of wilting under it'. (3) There is the *theological* approach, which makes us see that the Bible is a book of universal truth, which keeps us from thinking that it exists for nothing but our own personal comfort and good, which clarifies and enlarges our ideas, and which enables us to see the essential unity of the Bible.

Finally, Professor JESSOP suggests three methods of reading the Bible. (1) There is the method of going straight through it as it stands, a method which can cause little but bewilderment. (2) There is the method of reading it chronologically, which enables us to see the sun of revelation rise, until the full blaze of day comes in Jesus Christ. (3) There is the method of pursuing themes through it, which may well be the most illuminating of all.

This is not a big book in size, but we have seldom read a more honest and reverent exposition of what the Bible is and how we may best read it.

With lectures on preaching we are already tolerably well supplied, and it might be thought that no new testimony could possibly add anything of importance to what has already been said and written on the subject. But in his Lyman Beecher Lectures for 1957, *The Preacher's Task and the Stone of Stumbling*,[1] Dr. D. T. NILES sets the discussion in the context of his own situation in Ceylon, where Hindus, Muslims and Buddhists have to be reckoned with; and much valuable light is thereby shed, not only on the nature of the preacher's task, but on the factors which commonly condition Hindu, Muslim and Buddhist reactions to Christian preaching.

Dr. NILES begins with the acute observation (which, however, needs a little qualification) that nobody ever admits that it is over Jesus that he stumbles. Everybody claims that what he is rejecting is some unnecessary aspect of the Church's teaching about Jesus. So the preacher must constantly be asking himself whether he is preaching the historic faith of the Church, or importing notions of his own. With that question plainly stated, Dr. NILES examines first the Hindu refusal of the gospel. The preacher's task is 'to invite men to acknowledge Jesus Christ as their Saviour. And the Hindu refuses this invitation because he cannot accept the Christian estimate of the historical process or the Christian significance of history.' Faith which is based on a real Incarnation is to the Hindu 'an intolerably time-conditioned faith'; for him, salvation is the soul's escape from finite life through realization of its identity with that which is remotely above and beyond history. And, since salvation is therefore the realization of a universal truth, there can be many teachers of it—of whom Jesus may be one—but there cannot be one all-sufficient Saviour.

In the course of this argument, Dr. NILES boldly maintains that the preacher as such is not concerned with the question how Christ will deal hereafter with those who in this life have not found faith in Him, and that it is not within the preacher's competence to pass judgment on what others claim to be their experience of

[1] Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net.

salvation ; the preacher's business is simply to proclaim God's saving work in Christ, as He seeks and finds and makes disciples for His work on earth, His work of waging war on sin and the devil ; the preacher's call to men is not that they believe this or that concerning ultimate salvation, but that they enlist in Christ's army.

To those Christians who are conscious of, and sensitive to, the pieties of other religions, that is a helpful line of argument. The question does, of course, present itself whether it is possible wholeheartedly to believe in and proclaim Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of men without in fact making a judgment on other faiths. Dr. NILES would reply that the judgment is not ours, but Christ's.

Passing to the Muslim refusal of Christ, Dr. NILES notes that it is clearer and more consistent. The Hindu (like many others) says ' yes ' and ' no ' to Christ, the Muslim answer is a clear ' no '. Jesus is to him only a man, and Christianity is therefore a false faith. (But the ' yes ' is also faintly present, because Jesus is recognized to be a prophet.) What, then, is the ground of the Muslim refusal ? The Muslim himself will reply that to speak of incarnation is to derogate from the unity and majesty of God ; since God is one, an incarnation is unnecessary. Dr. NILES suggests that the last contention betrays an insufficient understanding of the reality and power of sin. Sin is rebellion from which the rebel cannot help seeking to return, but from which he *cannot* return, unless God first transforms the situation. And in Jesus He did, and does, transform the situation, by sending one in whom man and God can meet and share one life. Men may say it was unnecessary, but it did in fact happen, and to such a one as Saul of Tarsus it did in fact bring liberation which had seemed otherwise unattainable. That is also the sufficient answer to the Muslim contention that incarnation is impossible, and the crucifixion of the Son of God unthinkable. On the strange Muslim denial of the historical fact of Christ's death on the Cross, Dr. NILES suggests that the Muslim cannot accept it because it would compel him to recognize that God's glory is in fact most manifest where it is most humble.

When he turns to the Buddhist refusal of the gospel, because ' dogma ' is unacceptable, because belief in a good and almighty God involves hopeless contradictions, and because man must be his own saviour or endure the results of his own errors, Dr. NILES very properly notes that Christian dogmas arise from *events*, that true faith can rightly accept contradictions that baffle thought, that the grace which the gospel offers is no cheap grace such as the Buddha justly rejected, but a grace which is infinitely costly. And his final answer to the Buddhist who would dispense with God and have man rely on his own unaided efforts is that Jesus Christ is risen, and is *in fact* at work in the world.

Finally, the relation between the Christian preaching and non-Christian religions generally. Does it mean the offer of one religion to those who profess other religions ? And, if so, is Christianity to supplant the old, or to fulfil ? Is Christ to be conceived as offering to non-Christians a more secure foundation for an already existing faith ? Or are all religions, including Christianity, judged by Christ ? Or is Christ to bring about a rethinking of the non-Christian faiths ? Dr. NILES draws a sharp (but now familiar) distinction between the gospel and any sort of religion, Christian or other. We proclaim the gospel, or the message. And we proclaim it, not to other religions, but to men—men who may be deeply influenced by one or other of the great religious systems, but who by God's action in creation and redemption already belong to Him. And ' the Christian Message . . . not only poses the problem of man's response to God's will to redeem him, (but of his) response to God's desire to use him '. And the first qualification of one who is to be used in God's work is that he be known as belonging to Jesus Christ and to no one else.

Those who have wrestled with the constantly insistent problem of the non-Christian who reverences Christ, but has no thought of making public profession of his faith, will see much virtue in Dr. NILES' robust contention that ' the Christian message, in the last analysis, is concerned with creating messengers . . . To be a Christian one has to be an evangelist.' And many will likewise see much virtue in his insistence that our preaching is not to proclaim *our* religion against that of others, but to proclaim a gospel from God which brings all religions under judgment. Yet some will have a lingering doubt whether the distinction between human religion and the gospel of God is as clear-cut as Dr. NILES, and others, imply. Does not the gospel as we proclaim it include *our interpretation* of what Christ was and did ? Has there not, even within the Church itself, been considerable diversity in the assessment and interpretation of the data given in the history ? And must we not recognize as one of the inevitable conditions of our approach to non-Christians, that they do not as a matter of course accept our interpretation of the history as normative ?

Great Themes of the New Testament

III. Romans v. 12–21

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

The Letter to the Romans must always be central in any attempt to discover and to interpret the essence of the mind and thought of Paul. Romans is the nearest approach to a theological treatise that Paul ever wrote. For the most part Paul's letters were called forth by the immediate problems and perils which threatened his churches, and were produced to meet an immediate situation; but Dibelius says of Romans that of all Paul's letters it is least conditioned by the momentary situation.

Two great adjectives have been used to describe Romans. Sanday and Headlam called it *testamentary*. It is the testament of Paul; it is as if in it Paul sat down to distil the essence of his gospel and his faith in order to send an account of his essential belief to the Christian Church in the city which was the capital of the world. Burton called it *prophylactic*. Paul had never been in Rome when he wrote Romans, and had had no direct contact with the Church in Rome. But in all his churches he had seen the damage which could follow mistaken beliefs, misguided conceptions, ethical and theological eccentricities, false teaching and interrupted personal relationships. He, therefore, sent this letter to Rome so that, if any of these things did invade the Church at Rome, the Christians there might have a strong antiseptic and prophylactic to guard them against the poison and the infection of error.

Two interesting theories of the origin of Romans have been advanced. It has been suggested that the material in the early part of Romans was originally the material which Paul prepared for presentation at the Council of Jerusalem, when the Gentiles were accepted into the membership of the Church. And, indeed, nothing could so clearly demonstrate the right of entry of the Gentiles into the Church as the demonstration that Justification by Faith is the central fact of the Christian life and experience.

But the second theory of the origin of Romans is even more likely to be correct. All his life Paul had been haunted by the desire to see Rome. When he was in Ephesus, he was planning to go through Achaia and Macedonia again; then comes the sentence, straight from the heart: 'After I have been there, I must also see Rome' (Ac 19^{21}). When things in Jerusalem were grim and threatening, he had a vision of the Risen Christ. The Lord stood by him and said: 'Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome' (Ac 23^{11}). In the letter itself he writes: 'I long to see you' (1^{11}); and again: 'So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also' (1^{15}). It was in Corinth in the year A.D. 58 that Paul wrote Romans, and Rome was very much in his mind and in his plans.

At the moment he was just about to bring to its completion a scheme which had been very dear to his heart. He was about to take to Jerusalem the collection for the poor of the Church of Jerusalem which he had raised from his other churches (Ac $15^{25.\ 26}$). He knew that the journey to Jerusalem was fraught with danger, and that his enemies among the Jews would do their best to eliminate him, and he asks for the prayers of the Christians at Rome (Ac $15^{30.\ 31}$). But there are still greater plans simmering in his mind. He is planning to go on to Spain. It so happened that at this time there was a kind of blaze of greatness in Spain. Martial, the master of the epigram, and Lucan, the epic poet, were Spaniards, as were Columella and Pomponius Mela. Quintilian, the greatest of all the orators, was a Spaniard, and so was Seneca, dramatist, philosopher and prime minister of Nero. It would be something to touch for Christ a land which was producing such greatness. So Paul proposed to visit Rome on the way to Spain (Ac $15^{24.\ 28}$).

It is here that we may well have at one and the same time the reason why Paul wrote Romans and the reason for its centrality as an exposition of his thought and belief. When any general plans a new campaign, he must have a base of operations from which his lines may go out; and it may well be that Paul hoped to make Rome the basis of the campaign in the West, which he was planning.

The people of Rome did not know Paul personally ; he had neither founded the Church in Rome, nor had he ever visited it. So Paul may well have written this letter to enable the Roman Church to see exactly where he stood, and what he believed, and what he preached. Beyond a doubt mixed reports of him would have reached Rome, for Paul had his bitter enemies as well as his staunch friends ; and Romans may well have been the declaration of his faith, so that, when the time came, the Roman Church might be ready and willing to receive him, when he set out on his campaign in Spain. Whether Paul ever reached Spain or not must remain uncertain, although the balance of probability is all against it ; but, had his plans materialized, he certainly would have preached in Spain, and Rome would have been his base of operations.

There are indications that in the Early Church the Letter to the Romans did actually circulate as a compendium and manifesto of Pauline faith and belief. In our version of Romans the letter ends with a great doxology ($16^{25.\ 26}$). The textual history of that doxology is complicated and interesting and suggestive. We quote only the evidence of the uncial manuscripts in the following summary of it. The doxology appears at the end of the sixteenth chapter in ℵ, B, C, D, E. It appears at the end of ch. 14 in L. It appears in both places in A and P. In the Chester Beatty papyrus it appears at the end of ch. 15. In G it appears in neither place, although a space is left for it. In certain Latin manuscripts, for example Amiatinus and Fuldensis, there is a system whereby the text is divided into sections, and a summary of each section supplied. In such manuscripts the last two summaries are as follows. ' 50. On the peril of him who grieves his brother by meat ' (which must be a summary of 14^{15-23}). ' 51. On the mystery of the Lord kept secret before His passion, but after His passion revealed ', which can only be the doxology. This must mean that these sections and summaries were made from a version of Romans which did not include chs. 15 and 16. That such a version existed we could already have deduced, for a doxology can only come at the end, and there are manuscripts, as we have seen, which have the doxology at the end of ch. 14. To all this we must add the final textual fact. G, the manuscript which omits the doxology in both places, also omits all mention of Rome in 1^{7} and 1^{15}. According to it, the letter is written simply to all the beloved of God.

The conclusion of all this seems clear. Romans existed in two forms. It existed in the form in which we possess it ; and it existed in a form from which all the local references had been removed, and from which the last two chapters had been taken away. That must most likely mean that the Early Church was so convinced that Romans had in it the very essence of Pauline faith and doctrine that at some time a version of Romans was produced from which all local references were removed, and in which the letter was used as a compendium of Pauline doctrine for the whole Church at large.

When we are seeking to interpret Romans, we do well to remember that we are dealing with a letter which the Church has always believed to have in it the very essence and distillation of Paulinism.

The basic problem with which Romans deals is the basic problem of all life. It is the problem of how a man may enter into a right relationship with God. Paul looks at the pagan world ; and it is clear that the pagan world with its blatant immorality and its moral frustration has not solved that problem (1^{17-32}). No one was more conscious of that failure than were the pagan writers themselves. Men, said Seneca, are overwhelmingly conscious of their weakness and their inefficiency in necessary things. Men, he says with a kind of pessimistic hopelessness, love their vices and hate them at the same time. They hate their sins and cannot leave them. As Ovid had put it in the famous lines :

Video meliora, proboque ;
Deteriora sequor.

' I see and approve the better things, but I follow the worse ' (*Metamorphoses*, vii. 20). It was pitilessly clear that the pagan world had not found the way to enter into a right relationship with God. Nor had the Jewish world. In this Paul spoke from experience. As touching the righteousness which was in the law he could claim to be blameless (Ph 3^{6}), and yet, until Jesus Christ laid hands on him, he was conscious of nothing but moral helplessness, and spiritual estrangement from God. The reason for this failure is sin ; and in our passage Paul deals with the origin of sin, with man's inescapable involvement in sin as a human being, and with God's method of dealing with the situation.

First, then, Paul deals with the origin of sin. It is Paul's argument that by one man, that is, by Adam, sin entered into the world. Before we begin to examine what Paul meant by that, and the inferences he drew from that, let us see from where Paul started. That is to say, let us see what Jewish thought between the Testaments had to say about the origin of sin.

Jewish thought recognized the universality of sin. ' All the earth-born are defiled with iniquities, full of sins, laden with offences ' (4 Ezr 7^{68}). There is an ' innate evil thought in man ' (4 Ezr 7^{92}). It

was due to sin that death entered into the world. 'God created man for incorruption . . . but by the envy of the devil death entered into the world' (Wis $2^{23.\ 24}$). But whence came that sin?

To that question more than one answer was given. Sometimes it was held that the origin of sin was, so to speak, external to man. We have just seen that Wisdom says that it entered in 'by the envy of Satan'. In Enoch we read of an angel called Gadreel who 'showed the children of men all the blows of death, and led Eve astray' (Enoch 69^{6}). In the Books of Adam and Eve (The Apocalypse of Moses, 19) the story is told of how in the Garden the Devil tempted Eve and made her promise to give the forbidden fruit to Adam. 'He went and poured upon the fruit the poison of his wickedness, which is lust, the root and beginning of every sin, and he bent the branch on earth and I took of the fruit and ate.' But this was no real solution; it only pushes the origin of sin one step further back, and it does not explain what it was within man which caused man to fall to temptation.

The commonest Jewish explanation of sin was found in what is really a recognition of human experience. It was found in the doctrine of the two natures—the *Yetzer ha-tob* and the *Yetzer ha-ra'*, the good nature and the evil nature. It is a fact of universal human experience that in man there are two tendencies, one tendency which draws a man to goodness, and another tendency which draws a man to evil; and Jewish thought made much of the evil tendency in man. 'O evil tendency', laments Ben Sirach, 'wherefore wast thou created?' (Sir 37^{3}). The Rabbis called the evil tendency 'the strange god within man' (Shabbath 105 b). They called it 'the spoiler who spares none, bringing men to fall even at the advanced age of seventy or eighty'. So powerful is this evil tendency, this *yetzer ha-ra'*, that it can *become* the man. There is a rabbinic interpretation (Sukkah 52 b) of Nathan's parable to David (2 S 12^{4}). That verse reads: 'And there came *a traveller* unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and his own herd, to dress for *the wayfaring man* that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for *the man* that was come to him'. That is said to be symbolic of the *yetzer ha-ra'*. It comes to us first as *a traveller*; then it becomes *a guest*; and finally it becomes *a man* himself (quoted by Charles Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 149).

Having, then, installed the evil tendency in man as the origin and cause of sin, Jewish thought went in two directions. The first line of thought refused to absolve man for personal responsibility for his sin. The evil tendency was placed in man to be overcome, and God gave men the Law in order to counteract it, and constant study of the Law will enable a man to overcome it. Man is not in the unbreakable grip of an external power; he can and must choose. 'Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man of himself has created it, and under a great curse shall they fall who commit it' (Enoch 98^{4}).

But the very strenuousness with which many of the Jewish writers insist on personal responsibility shows that there was another line of thought. The idea of the *yetzer ha-ra'* has only pushed the question still one further step back. Whence came the *yetzer ha-ra'*? It is here that Jewish rabbinic thought produced one of the most dangerous of all doctrines. God, they said, created all things, and, therefore, God created the *yetzer ha-ra'*. True, God also created the Law as a means of healing, but God created the evil tendency. 'God said, it repents me that I created the evil tendency in man; for if I had not done so, he would not have rebelled against me. I created the evil tendency; I created the Law as a means of healing. If you occupy yourself with the Law, you will not fall into the power of it. God placed the good tendency on a man's right hand and the evil on his left' (cf. the Midrash *Bereshith Rabba*, xxvii.; the Babylonian *Talmud, Qiddushin* 30 b).

Philo tries to avoid this conclusion. He takes the phrase, 'Let us make man' (Gn 1^{26}). 'Why is the plural used? In order that men's successes may be attributed to God, but their failures may be laid on others. For it did not seem right to God to fashion with His own hand the downward inclination in man, wherefore He entrusted this portion of His work to His subordinate agents' (*De Conf. Ling.*, 35, 36).

The inevitable result of this attribution of the evil tendency to the creation of God was that men felt that they could blame God for their sins. That is why Ben Sirach breaks out:

Say not, It is through the Lord that I fell away;
For thou shalt not do the things that He hateth.
Say not thou, It is He that caused me to err;
For he hath no need of a sinful man. . . .
He made man from the beginning,
And left him in the hand of his own counsel.
If thou wilt, thou shalt keep His commandments;
And to perform faithfulness is of thine own good pleasure.
He hath set fire and water before thee:
Thou shalt stretch forth thine hand unto whichsoever thou wilt.
Before man is life and death;
And whichsoever he liketh, it shall be given him
(Sir 15^{11-17}).

And that is why James forbids a man to say that he is tempted by God (Ja 1^{13-15}).

When Paul wrote Ro 5 all this was in his mind; but there was more. In Ro 5 Paul makes much of the story of the Fall in Gn 3. In the rest of the Old Testament that story has no influence; and in the New Testament, apart from the writings of Paul, it plays no part. But we do find the germs of Paul's use of it between the Testaments.

Ben Sirach writes:

> From a woman was the beginning of sin
> And because of her we all die
>
> (Sir 25^{24}).

This is a first step toward the Pauline use of the story of the Fall; but it must be noted that the word which is used for *beginning* is *techillah* which means *beginning* not in the causative but in the temporal sense. This means that the act of Eve was 'the beginning of the history of sin as far as man is concerned'.

Another step toward the Pauline use of the story of the Fall is to be found in 4 Ezra. 4 Ezra combines the idea of the evil tendency and of the permanent effect of the Fall. 'A grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced unto this time, and shall yet produce until the threshing-floor come' (4 Ezr 4^{30}). The permanent effect is spoken of in another passage: 'Then the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate; the Law indeed was in the heart of the people, but (in conjunction) with the evil germ; so what was good departed, and the evil remained' (4 Ezr $3^{20\text{-}22}$). This writer breaks out despairingly: 'Better had it been that the earth had not produced Adam, or else, having once produced him (for thee), to have restrained him from sinning. . . . O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants!' (4 Ezr $7^{116\text{-}126}$). All the promises and all the gifts of Paradise and of the eternal age are as nothing if man is involved in futility and corruption and in the works which bring death because of the fall of Adam. In 4 Ezra the conception is that the sin of Adam brought something into the world which has involved all men in the darkness and the death of sin instead of the light and the glory of incorruption for which man was created. Just how this happened is not fully worked out—as it is in Paul—but the situation is decisively described.

Still one other of the books between the Testaments makes use of the story of Adam and of the Fall. In 2 Baruch the story occurs again. In it the idea is that the first sin of Adam brought death into the world and involved all men in physical death, but it did not necessarily involve man in sin.

> For though Adam first sinned
> And brought untimely death upon all,
> Yet of those who were born from him
> Each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come,
> And again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come. . . .
> Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul,
> But each of us has been the Adam of his own soul
>
> (2 Bar $54^{15\text{-}19}$).

Here R. H. Charles comments: 'The evil impulse is not sin unless obeyed. It is placed in man, say the Talmudists, to be overcome.'

It can be seen that the story of the Fall, although it had no influence on Old Testament thought, did exercise a very great influence on the thought of the writers between the Testaments. The way was prepared for Paul to use it. But Paul in his use of it was completely original. Oesterley points out that in the later Jewish theology, while Adam is universally regarded as the cause of the entry of death into the world, that happened, not so much because of his fall, as because of his refusal to show penitence for what he had done. 'When Adam transgressed the command of the Holy One, and ate of the tree, the Holy One demanded of him penitence, thereby revealing to him the means of freedom (from the result of his guilt). But Adam would not show penitence' (Midrash *Bemidbar Rabba*, xiii.). As we shall see, that is very different from the thought of Paul.

We have now seen the background and the heritage of thought into which Paul entered. It may be said that the materials of Pauline thought are there; but Paul was to make a new use of them, and what that use was we must now go on to see. [*To be continued*

Professor Oscar Cullmann's 'Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments'

By Dr. Vincent Taylor, F.B.A., St. Annes-on-Sea

British theology is deeply indebted to Professor Oscar Cullmann for his *Christ and Time; Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, and *The State in the New Testament*, and for his valuable essays, *Baptism in the New Testament* and *Early Christian Worship*. Recently what may be regarded as his *magnum opus*, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* [1957], has been published, a volume in which he gathers and expands much that he has taught during twenty years at Strassburg and in his *Zenos Lectures* at the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago. It is to be hoped that in due time this work will be translated; but meantime readers of The Expository Times may welcome a preliminary summary and evaluation.

Professor Cullmann begins by reminding us of the nature of the Christological problem as it exists in primitive Christianity. The earliest theology, he observes, is almost exclusively Christology, and it brings the Person and the Work of Christ into the closest connexion. The later Christological controversies concern almost completely the Person of Christ in its relation to that of God and to the divine and human natures of Christ. Historically this was necessary and unavoidable; but if we want to see the New Testament problem in its true perspective, we must turn away from these later discussions. In the New Testament the question 'Who is Christ?' never means exclusively or in the first place, 'What is His nature?', but 'What is His function?'.

In answering the question 'Who is Jesus?' the first Christians had at their disposal certain notions already present in Judaism, especially in Jewish eschatology. The problem therefore presented itself in the form, 'How far did Jesus fulfil these ideas?', 'At what point does His work go beyond them and stand in contradiction to them?'. In considering the problem we cannot put on one side the question of Jesus' own self-consciousness, for *a priori* we have to reckon with the probability that in His teaching and life He created something new, from which the first Christians took their departure in attempting to explain His Person and Work. The answers were given in ready-made titles, each one of which described a function. Each sets Jesus within a certain category. Professor Cullmann classifies them in four groups: (1) those which describe the *earthly* work of Jesus, the Prophet, the Suffering Servant, the High Priest; (2) those which relate to the *future*, the Messiah and the Son of Man; (3) those which describe His *present* work, the Lord and the Saviour; and finally (4) those which relate to His *pre-existence*, the Word and the Son of God. Other important names, Mediator, Lamb of God, Son of David, King, Judge, do not call for separate treatment because they can be embraced under the above titles.

I

In treating the subject, *Jesus the Prophet*, Professor Cullmann describes the Jewish belief in the Prophet of the End-time, and discusses the importance of Dt 18^{15}, with reference to the expectation of the return of Elijah and parallel conceptions which gather round the figures of Moses and Enoch, and later the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran sect. Neither Jesus nor the Evangelists used this conception as a solution of the Christological problem, but it is present in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 6^{14}) and the Acts (3^{22} 7^{37}). It was clearly a view held among the people in the lifetime of Jesus, and was developed later in the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' and in the 'Preaching of Peter'. The future belonged to other solutions, but the idea of the Prophet has played a historical rôle in Islam. What is of value in it is included in other names and titles of Jesus.

Professor Cullmann is among those who find great Christological significance in the form of *the Suffering Servant*. He believes that the association of the idea with that of the Son of Man in the Gospel sayings goes back to Jesus Himself. It was not the primitive Christian community which first established a relation between these fundamental Christological titles. Great interest is aroused by Professor Cullmann's exposition of Ph 2^{5-11}, which he also treats later in connexion with the names 'Son of Man' and 'the Lord'. The influence of the Servant conception is to be seen in the 'hymn', in the reference to the obedience of Christ 'unto death'. Already a traditional element by the time that Paul wrote, this teaching passed into the background in spite of the fact that it can be traced to Jesus Himself, lingering only in liturgical texts, in the *Didache* and the community prayer in *I Clement*. The reason is clear. Although the Servant

conception was in every way adequate to describe the earthly aspect of the saving deed of Christ, it needed to be supplemented by other ideas in order to provide room for the *present* activity of Christ and the experience of His presence known in the breaking of the bread. Nevertheless, Professor Cullmann insists, this Christian designation deserves greater attention in modern theology than is usually given to it, not only because it is one of the oldest answers to the question, 'Who is Jesus?', but because in it we come nearest to the secret of His self-consciousness. He does not use the name 'Servant' because for Him another idea is fundamental, that of the Son of Man, and with this He has connected the concept of the Servant.

Some surprise may be caused by the fact that Professor Cullmann has included the title, *the High Priest*, among the names which are significant for the earthly life of Jesus, for usually we think of this office as belonging pre-eminently to His present and eternal ministry. The nature of this ministry is fully recognized by him in a penetrating study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ is represented as the Priest in an absolute and final sense, as the fulfilment of all priesthood. This notion, Professor Cullmann suggests, is not far removed from that of the Servant. The new element in the conception is that Christ offers Himself (9[28]), and shares completely in the humanity of His brethren (2[17]), especially in experiencing the reality of temptation (5[7f.]). In the statement that He 'learned obedience' (5[8]) a development is assumed. Christ, it is taught 'suffered once for all' (10[10]), and by His self-offering we are sanctified 'for all time' (10[14]). Can a place for these ideas be found in the mind of the historical Jesus? Professor Cullmann thinks so. He reminds us that in His day Ps 110 must have been interpreted messianically and that Judaism knew of an ideal priest who in the End-time must fulfil the Jewish high priestly office. It is not excluded that Jesus has related to Himself, not the title, but the concept of an ideal high priest 'after the order of Melchizedek'. In support of this suggestion he mentions the discourse about David's Son in Mk 12[35ff.] and the answer of Jesus to Caiaphas, 'You will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven' (Mk 14[62]). He will be the heavenly Son of Man and the heavenly high priest! 'Here', says Professor Cullmann, 'perspectives open of far-reaching importance for Jesus' self-consciousness'.[1]

II

The second group of titles concern the *future*. As regards the *Messiah* Professor Cullmann agrees that Jesus treated the name 'the Christ' with the greatest reserve. He does not expressly reject the title when others assign it to Him, but energetically repudiates the ideas of a political kingship associated with it. Far from sharing His reserve, the primitive Christian community, in consequence of the Easter experience and the expectation of the Parousia, raised the statement, 'Jesus is the Messiah', to the level of a confession. In the Hellenistic communities, however, 'Christ' became a proper name. Paul knows that it is not really a proper name. Professor Cullmann rejects the opinion which many hold (in dependence on J. Weiss) that Ro 9[5] is the only passage in which Paul uses the name in the sense of the 'Messiah'. Controversies with Jews, in the endeavour to make faith in Jesus intelligible, favoured its use.

As we know, Jesus preferred the name, *the Son of Man*. Professor Cullmann goes so far as to say that, along with the idea of the Servant of the Lord, the Son of Man conception is the most important title to be investigated. His treatment of the title, its interpretation by the Jews and in particular by Philo of Alexandria, and its use by Jesus, by Paul, and other New Testament writers, takes its place among the classic discussions of this theme. He rejects Lietzmann's view, that Jesus did not regard Himself as 'the Son of Man'. He recognizes that in one or two sayings (Mk 2[27f.] and Mt 12[31.] (Lk 12[10])) *barnasha* denotes man or mankind. 'In the rest of the words of Jesus', he says, 'this explanation is excluded'.[2] The view that in such eschatological sayings as Lk 17[22f.], Mt 24[27. 37ff.] and Mk 8[38] Jesus speaks of some one other than Himself 'raises more problems than it solves'.[3] The distinctive function of the coming Son of Man is that of judging, but a new turn is given to the idea by the fact that in the teaching of Jesus the End is already present (Mt 11[4ff.] 12[28]), and, further, by the connexion which He finds between the Son of Man and the Servant of God (Mk 10[45]). Both notions existed separately in Judaism. The new feature in the teaching of Jesus is His combination of the two.

Professor Cullmann finds this same combination in the teaching of Paul. Although the actual title, 'the Son of Man', is not used by him, the idea of the incarnate Heavenly Man, 'the Second Adam', is the centre of gravity in his interest. One sees this from three passages in his Epistles which deserve special attention—1 Co 15[45ff.], Ro 5[12-21], and Ph 2[5-11]. All have to do with Christ as 'the Second Adam'. It is not possible to discuss in detail here Professor Cullmann's exposition of these passages, and I regret that I must limit myself to a brief reference to the third.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 88.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 157.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 159.

Philippians 2^{5-11}, Professor Cullmann maintains, is extraordinarily rich in its Christological implications because it combines three conceptions, the Son of Man, the Servant of the Lord, and the *Kyrios* idea. The 'hymn', he submits, uses the idea of the Heavenly Man in connexion with Adam. Its use of the Genesis story, as J. Héring has argued, is assured at the outset by the word μορφή, which corresponds to the Hebrew *demutha* and the Greek εἰκών, 'image', a conception which appears often in the Pauline Epistles (cf. Col 1^{15}, 2 Co 4^{4}; cf. 2 Co 3^{18}, and Ro 12^{2}). The 'form of God' which Christ had from the beginning is that of the Heavenly Man. Unlike Adam, Christ did not count equality with God as a thing to be snatched (*res rapienda*), but divested Himself of it in becoming man, and like the Servant He 'became obedient unto death'. God, however, exalted Him, giving to Him the *Kyrios* name. Indeed He did more. In agreeing with Héring, Professor Cullmann maintains that αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν (*v.* 9) means 'He did *more* than exalt him', and he explains this gift as that of a new function exercised in a still closer association with God and consisting in Lordship over all things. In short, the 'hymn' contains a complete Christology.

Even an unavoidably brief summary such as this reveals, I trust, the importance of the exposition. Nevertheless, with a full appreciation of its merits, I think it suffers from the attempt to claim too much. There may be a side-glance at Adam who wanted to be as God, but I doubt if this contrast dominates the passage. Adam, it is to be noted, is not mentioned in it, as he is in 1 Co $15^{45ff.}$ and Ro 5^{12-21}. Moreover, the rendering, 'He did not account it as robbery' (*v.* 6), is far from certain. Again, the phrases, 'taking the form of a servant' (*v.* 7) and 'becoming obedient even unto death' (*v.* 8), afford only a slender link with the idea of the Servant, which in the case of Paul is a traditional rather than a vital concept. And, finally, after all can αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν mean 'He did *more* than exalt him'? But whether or not we can accompany Professor Cullmann throughout the whole of his exegetical journey, there is no doubt that he brings out the immense Christological importance of the idea of the Son of Man. He challenges us by claiming that in the Fourth Gospel *as a whole* the doctrine of the Son of Man is much more important than that of the Logos.

III

Among the titles which describe the *present* work of Christ first place is rightly given to the name *the Lord*. Professor Cullmann's discussion of this name is a weighty contribution to the long debate which followed the challenge of W. Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* [1913], in which it was claimed that this designation was carried over from the Hellenistic religious world and applied to Jesus by the first Christians. Thanks to important discussions by A. E. J. Rawlinson, A. S. Peake, and others, British scholars have been familiar with this debate for nearly a generation, but it is of great interest to see it handled by a new and gifted contributor. It is well established, he allows, that the *Kyrios* title as applied to Jesus first received its full meaning after His exaltation.[1] But it is used indirectly in Mk $12^{35ff.}$ and directly in Mk 11^{3} and Mt 7^{21}. None of these passages shows the absolute use of the name as it was applied to Jesus in primitive Christianity, but something more than a teacher-disciple relationship is disclosed. Professor Cullmann contests, as many have done, the claim that an attitude of religious reverence towards Christ first became possible on Hellenistic soil. The ever-increasing designation of Jesus as Lord in Hellenistic Christianity assumes that already He was the object of Divine veneration in the worship of the original community and not first at Antioch. The eucharistic prayer, 'Maranatha' (cf. 1 Co 16^{22}), meant both, 'Come Lord at the end!' and, 'Come Lord *now* while we are gathered here at the meal!' The *Kyrios* title goes back to the experience of the original community in worship.[2] Its use is closely connected with prayer to Christ and with confession in its oldest form, 'Jesus is Lord' (cf. Ro 10^{9}, Ph $2^{6ff.}$, 1 Co 12^{3}). Even when the titles 'Lord' or 'King' are not expressly used, the Lordship of Christ is implied in the frequent references to His sitting at the right hand of God, and the Lordship mentioned is exercised over the Church, the whole universe of things, and the heart of the individual. In the New Testament, Old Testament *Kyrios* titles are often without more ado applied to Jesus. All the functions of God, even that of the Creator, are ascribed to Him (cf. Heb 1^{10}).

The title 'Saviour' as applied to Jesus is relatively late. Professor Cullmann does not accept the explanation I myself suggested in *The Names of Jesus* (p. 109), that its pagan associations delayed its currency in the primitive tradition, observing that the same might be said in higher measure of the name 'the Lord'. Professor Cullmann suggests that the surpassing rôle of the *Kyrios* title put all others into the shadow. It was through faith in the Exalted Lord that the name 'the Saviour', with its Old Testament associations, was carried over to Christ. Referring to Ph 3^{20} he agrees with Bultmann that the name was a pre-Pauline designation.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 209.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 221.

IV

The last part of Professor Cullmann's work, as I have said, treats the titles which relate to the *pre-existence* of Christ, the Logos and the Son of God.

The account given of the Christological use of the *Logos-conception* is perhaps the most difficult part of the work. Professor Cullmann recognizes that the Logos-idea, widespread in Greek thought and later Rabbinical speculation, must have been familiar to the Fourth Evangelist. Indeed he concedes that he may have used an existing Hymn to Wisdom or even a Mandæan source, although, in this case it does not follow that his own beliefs coincided with those of the source. The Evangelist has not simply taken over current speculations about a Divine revealer or mediator. His greatest debt is to Palestinian Judaism and especially to what the Genesis story has to say about creation by the Word of God. The Word is God's self-communication of Himself in action, and cannot be separated from God. The Johannine statements in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel spring from deep theological reflection about the human life lived by Jesus. He Himself is the Word because He is the centre of the self-revelation of God. He is the Word which God speaks. He is not, therefore, subordinated to Him, and is not a Second God. As the Word, He is given along with God. He is God and was 'with God'. The New Testament gives no explanation of this paradox. Hence all abstract speculation about the two Natures of Christ is not only a useless undertaking, but is not justified because nothing can be said about the Word apart from the activity of God. As the Word, Christ is God from the beginning in so far as God reveals Himself to the world (*insofern er sich der Welt offenbart*) (p. 274).

The treatment given to the title *Son of God* is comprehensive. The rejection of the view that it is to be traced back to Hellenistic usage is brilliantly argued. The name is not associated in the New Testament with the working of wonders, as in Hellenistic thought, and no good reason can be given why the first Christians should have designated Christ 'the Son of God' except that He so spoke of Himself. In favour of the view that Jesus used the title of Himself the relevant sayings are examined, Mk 1^{11} 9^{7} 12^{6} 13^{32}, Mt 11^{27} 16^{17}, as well as the Johannine sayings in which the Evangelist believes himself to be writing under the guidance of the Paraclete. Used comparatively rarely by Jesus, the title belongs to His innermost self-consciousness; it expresses His attitude of obedience to the Father and the unity of His will with Him. The confession 'Jesus is the Son of God' goes back to the early days of the original Christian community, and was very probably employed in the earliest Baptism liturgy, as the early textual addition in Ac 8^{37} [1] suggests. Although used by Paul much less frequently than the *Kyrios* title, it appears in the Epistles in connexion with the Father's saving work (*Heilsplan*); in Ro 8^{32} in relation to the story of the offering of Isaac. Professor Cullmann makes the striking claim that 1 Co 15^{28}, which speaks of the time when the Son shall subject Himself to the Father, is the key for all New Testament Christology. The name also stands in the closest association with the Father's activity in revelation (but 'not to the being of God'). In this activity the Father and the Son are one. We can say of the Son as of the Word, 'He is God in so far as God reveals Himself in His saving activities' (*insofern Gott sich im Heilsgeschehen offenbart*).[2]

There is much more in this interesting section which is worthy of close study, not least the account Professor Cullmann gives of the attitude which each of the evangelists takes with reference to the title. He recognizes the comparative rarity of the name in the Pastoral Epistles, James, 1 Peter, the Acts, and the Apocalypse, and suggests that in wide circles of primitive Christianity the deeper understanding of its Christological importance more or less got lost.[3] In *The Names of Jesus* [4] I tentatively suggested that 'Lord' is used where worship is the main interest and 'the Son' where the teaching interest is prominent. Professor Cullmann does not think this view is satisfactory, but unfortunately does not himself offer an explanation.

I hope the account I have given of this work, incomplete as it must necessarily be, reveals its stimulating character. It is positive, challenging, and constructive. It is opposed to any mythical interpretation of the Person of Christ. On the contrary, it strongly emphasizes the reality of His human life, while insisting that the New Testament writers present Him as 'the image of God'. The author claims that, while the fact that He is the Son of Man dominates His consciousness, all that is contained in this title must be supplemented by all that is contained in His fulfilment of the destiny of suffering and redemption as the Servant of God, and also by His obedient relationship with the Father in a unity of purpose to which elsewhere there is no parallel. He rightly insists that we must consider the Person and the Work of Christ together, and both as bound up from first to last

[1] 'And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.'

[2] *Op. cit.*, 300.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 311.

[4] P. 57. 'The first Christians,' I wrote, 'fervently believed in "the Son," but they invoked "the Lord."'

with the saving purpose and with the activity of God in creation and redemption.

These are great and positive gains, and in esteeming them we may hesitate to advance criticisms. This, however, is just what Professor Cullmann in his Preface has asked for. I therefore raise one important point which will claim the attention of many readers. Frequently he presents Christ as God in so far as He reveals Himself. This Christology has the merit of simplicity, but it could be a costly simplicity, since if taken *au pied de la lettre* it suggests inadequate solutions of the Christological problem. I do not suppose that Professor Cullmann means that Christ is God *only* as He reveals Himself.[1] Nevertheless, the language used is capable of a Sabellian interpretation of Christ's Person which is far from his intention. This situation is probably brought about by his repeated endeavour to avoid the categories of 'Substance' and 'Nature' which were so prominent in the discussions of the fourth and fifth centuries. He wishes to confine the problem of the Person of Christ within Biblical and Jewish categories. This desire is characteristic of much of the theology of our time, and Professor Cullmann's book raises the important question, whether, with the highest fidelity to Biblical principles, we can avoid pushing out into Greek waters. We certainly cannot adopt outworn conceptions, but it seems highly doubtful if we can reach any satisfactory explanation of the Person of Christ without seeking to show in what sense He was Divine and in what sense He was human, and, above all, how His divine nature is related to the being of God. In short, can we have a satisfactory Christology without a trinitarian foundation?

[1] In his discussion of Ph 2^{5-11} Professor Cullmann says of the Exaltation of Christ that we have not to do here with the teaching of Adoptionism. See p. 185.

Literature

BARTH'S CHURCH DOGMATICS

The translation of Barth's *Church Dogmatics* goes on apace. The latest volume to appear is IV. 2, in which he continues his treatment of *The Doctrine of Reconciliation* (T. and T. Clark; 55s. net). Almost half the book deals with the Person of Christ, true God and true man. There is no question of deity being transformed into humanity or vice versa. The humanity is no less integral to His Person than the deity, and it is so for ever. Christ does not cease to be God—God cannot cease to be God—but the one unchangeably true God became and is unchangeably true man. Yet the union is not external, like two planks lashed or glued together, but is by mutual participation. The human nature is not divinized but taken into deity. The Divine appropriates the human and penetrates it with all the Divine attributes. Thus the human nature is not destroyed but enhanced and enriched.

Turning to the relation of the human nature which Christ took to sin Barth maintains that it was our sinful nature that He took (or there could have been no solidarity with our lostness) but 'in our sinful existence as man He did not sin'. He did not become guilty though He bore an alien guilt.

In a section of over a hundred pages on 'The Royal Man' Barth deals with aspects of the life and ministry of Jesus. His treatment of miracles is particularly interesting. So also is his observation that Protestanism has erred in setting the problem of repentance where the good news of the Kingdom of God ought to be.

The following section takes up the theme of the Atonement. While the life of Jesus was His own history He is also representative man and all that He did belongs to man. When He died all men died in Him; when He rose again and ascended into heaven all men rose and ascended with Him, so that the life of all men is 'hid with Christ in God'. Reconciliation is not fragmentary, to use Forsyth's expression, but solidary. There is an objective reconciliation of all men to God in Christ. All men were born again, justified, sanctified, converted, at Golgotha. Christians differ from non-Christians in that they know this, and live in the light and power of it.

In the second part of the volume Barth deals with how people become Christians and what is involved in Christian living, and it is soon obvious that he is much less at home in this part of the Lord's vineyard. In our conversion, he says, we are borne on eagle's wings, but the wings turn out to be very frail. Barth shows all the usual Lutheran and Reformed inhibitions when he develops the doctrine of sanctification. He shows the usual unholy fear of admitting that God actually makes a mighty difference in a man who has become a *de facto* Christian, lest he should presume. Though he writes so much that is excellent on Christian love (and incidentally rebukes Nygren for being too unloving in his study of eros) he cannot allow that the Christian's love is the downstreaming of God's love, as

Luther teaches, because that destroys all healthy distances. When, however, he says God's love always has the character of grace, the Christian's that of gratitude he will carry all his readers with him.

In his study of the Church as the community of the Holy Spirit Barth states his preference for the word ministry to that 'fatal' word office and it is significant that in a considerable section on the order of the Church he never mentions bishops or presbyters. There is no place for a 'hierarchy' among brothers. As visible the Church must have form but the form may vary according to changing circumstances.

The volume deals with many subjects which are prominent in current theological discussions, and always, needless to say, in a massive way. Readers will wish to add their thanks to those of the author to the translators for their selfless and highly competent achievement.

PERCY SCOTT

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Books on the theology of the Old Testament bid fair to rival in number those on the Dead Sea Scrolls, and each has some special feature or quality which distinguishes it from the others. The Dutch Professor, Th. C. Vriezen, some years ago published a volume on this subject in Dutch, of which more recently a revised and enlarged edition appeared, as well as a translation of this into German. Now an English translation has been published under the title *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (Veenman en Zonen, Wageningen, and Blackwell, Oxford; 42s. net). The special feature of this work is that while it is an Old Testament Theology, it is written from the standpoint of a Christian scholar. This does not mean that he reads the New Testament into the Old, and offers a typological interpretation of the Old. It means that while he sees the Old Testament as having a character of its own, distinct from the New, he does not think it is without reason that the Old and New Testaments together constitute the Christian Bible. He sees a profound unity in the Bible running through the diversity of the Testaments, and in his study of the theology of the Old Testament finds himself unable to forget its culmination in the New.

About one third of the work is taken up with the Introduction, in which such questions as the attitude of the Church to the Old Testament from the earliest days and the use of the Old Testament in the Church, the historical character of the Old Testament revelation and the spiritual structure of the Old Testament literature, and the fundamental task and method of the Old Testament theologian are considered. Professor Vriezen sees Israel in the setting of its own contemporary world; but he also sees it in its uniqueness and he cannot forget to what that uniqueness led. He says: 'When the Bible is seen in its true Christian aspect, it is immediately apparent that its authority and real value do not lie in its "infallibility" or in its historical accuracy, but in its truth, *i.e.* the reliability and unrestricted character of its message of salvation and life; and therefore in the existential validity of what the Bible has to say about God and man, sin and grace, life and death, the world and its creation anew' (p. 86). These therefore are the themes with which the author deals in the main body of the work.

That this work is an important treatment of its theme, and especially important to the Christian theologian, is abundantly clear. The author is a scholar of high standing in his own country and beyond, and the footnotes and bibliographies at the end of the various chapters testify to his wide acquaintance with the literature relevant to his study.

H. H. ROWLEY

JOHN WHITE

Anyone who wishes to understand the Church of Scotland to-day and its history in the present century must steep himself in Augustus Muir's *John White, C.H., D.D., LL.D.* (Hodder and Stoughton; 42s. net). It is a biography on a generous scale, reminding one of the tributes accorded by fervent admirers to Scottish churchmen of last century. In recent times its only rivals are the lives of Rainy by Carnegie Simpson, of Charteris by Arthur Gordon, and of Alexander Whyte by G. F. Barbour. Perhaps it might have been a little shorter, for there are minor matters where the narrative could with advantage have been curtailed; but that cannot be said of the considerable areas where the story of John White's work virtually coincides with the story of the Church of Scotland. Such coincidence appears particularly in the twenty years of negotiation which led to the Union of 1929 and in the campaign for Church Extension necessitated by the migration of so large a proportion of Scotland's population to new housing areas. Mr. Muir's account of these matters is excellent, and future historians as well as present readers will be grateful to him for his researches into Dr. White's papers and for his clear and enthralling narrative.

John White was a powerful personality with a vigorous and penetrating mind and no small power of incisive speech. He had some of the defects of his great qualities. Mr. Muir mentions impatience, but his account, eulogistic as it is, bears witness

to something that could be described by a stronger term. On the other hand Mr. Muir has done well to lift the veil and let the reader see that White was both a kindlier and a more godly man than they could understand who knew him only as a wise and forceful leader and a keen debater. We are particularly grateful for a moving quotation from his talk recorded twelve days before his death but not broadcast until after his body had been laid to rest. It rings with the assurance of the life everlasting and it contains his own explanation of his faith—'I met a Man'. Second only to this we should put the words spoken to the students of Trinity College, Glasgow. 'May I give you two thoughts that have often steadied me when I have been overwhelmed with the confusions and alarms of the world. First, God has put too much of Himself into this world to forsake it now. Second, it is not in the world that we have faith but in Him who overcame the world.'

A phrase on p. 103 and the footnote there need correction. The decision in the Free Church case of 1904 gave victory to the minority's appeal by five judges to two in the House of Lords.

STEWART MECHIE

J. E. L. OULTON

A brochure, which is in some sense a memorial volume, entitled *Fundamentals of the Faith* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), containing Papers, Addresses and Sermons by the late Professor J. E. L. Oulton, D.D., has been published, edited with a memoir by Canon H. M. Harriss. At the time of his lamented death Dr. Oulton was Regius Professor in the University of Dublin and Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral. A list of his principal published works is supplied. The Papers and Addresses treat 'The Theology and Practice of Christian Initiation', 'The Authority of the Old Testament', 'The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity', 'The Doctrine of the Last Things', 'Liberalism in Christian Theology', 'Our Controversy with the Baptists', and 'The "Parish and People" Movement'. The themes of the Sermons are the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Trinity, and these are followed by Professor Oulton's last sermon, on the text, 'The Lord is my light and my salvation'. It will be seen from this list how strong was his interest in theology and especially Biblical theology. A Foreword is supplied by the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. G. O. Simms.

It is by no means an underestimate to say that the most interesting part of the volume is Canon Harriss's memoir which, as the Archbishop says, 'indicates with a fine appreciation the deep-laid riches which lay hidden in a personality, gentle and reserved'. 'Oulton himself', writes Canon Harriss, 'would be the first to admit how much his successful dealing with men in the Divinity School, and his intensely human approach to theology, owed to his long and wide experience in direct pastoral activities.' His high regard for truth, and his great interests in theology, sport, the poets, and music are faithfully recorded. Readers of his 'Mystery of the Cross', reviewed in this journal in October, 1957, will recall his remarkable tribute to Bach. Among the addresses the most notable perhaps is that on the Holy Trinity in which he refers to Professor Hodgson's discussion of this subject and says, 'We have no guarantee that had it not been for the theological material concerning the Holy Spirit to be found in the writings of St. Paul and St. John, and to a lesser degree in St. Luke, the Church might easily have become and remained Binitarian.' Many others besides Professor Oulton's students will want to possess this stimulating volume.

VINCENT TAYLOR

ST. METHODIUS

The twenty-seventh volume in the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series is entitled St. Methodius, *The Symposium, A Treatise on Chastity*, translated and annotated by Dr. Herbert Musurillo, S.J. (Longmans; 21s. or 18s. on standing order for the series).

Methodius himself is an enigmatic figure. He must have lived and written about A.D. 280. He was certainly a Christian teacher, and possibly a bishop and a martyr, and the sphere of his activity seems to have been in Lycia. He was obviously a man of pagan culture, because his pages are liberally sprinkled with quotations from Plato, although very often he does not seem to have understood the thought of Plato at all. His patron was a lady called Telmesiake, herself either unmarried or a widow. In her house was a group of young girls whom she was urging to accept the way of virginity; and it is doubtless for them that Methodius wrote *The Symposium*. It purports to describe the conversation at a banquet held in the gardens of Arete. After the banquet Arete invited the maidens present to enter into a competition in praise of chastity and virginity; and the eleven resulting discourses form *The Symposium*.

But Methodius was far from giving instruction only on celibacy and virginity in this form. He also gives a practical instruction on the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, on the nature of the millennium and the hereafter (Methodius was a Chiliast), on the divinity of Christ, on the fallacy

of astrology, on the freedom of the will, on the meaning of world history, on prayer, and on the method of combating temptations. He holds that human relationships began with incest, moved on to polygamy, reached monogamy, and finally reached that chastity which is possible only in Jesus Christ. Methodius is important both in the history of asceticism and in the development of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture. *The Symposium* is an instructive document. 'But it is more: it is perhaps the most beautiful symbolic prose-poem of the early patristic period'.

The last English translation of *The Symposium* was in 'The Ante-Nicene Fathers' series. Dr. Musurillo's translation is far in advance of the translation there, and catches not a little of the charm of the original; and his annotations are scholarly, helpful, and more than adequate. This is a valuable addition to an already valuable series.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

ISLAMIC THINKERS

The revived interest in one of the most remarkable Islamic thinkers has produced a number of works recently dealing with various aspects of his life, thought and influence, but the latest volume by Dr. Soheil M. Afnan—*Avicenna: His Life and Works* (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net)—unquestionably is the most comprehensive study of Avicenna that has appeared set against the background of his times and based on the original sources in Persian and Arabic. After a general introduction to the 'Abbasid Age in the tenth century, in which his great predecessors, Kindi and Farabi, were outstanding figures, the life and work of Avicenna are described in an arresting manner bringing into relief his amazing intellectual powers amid all the vicissitudes of his career, ranging from adulation to furious onslaughts, high office to imprisonment, brilliant success to abject failure and dissipation. Then follow lucid and concise accounts of his logic, metaphysics, his contributions to psychology, medicine and the material sciences, and to the problems of religion, in which field he was hailed as a mystic and profound philosopher, and denounced as an atheist and a heretic; not always without some justification in any of these respects. Finally, his influence in the East and in the West is discussed and estimated. A notable feature of a notable book is the use made of the Arabic translations of Hellenistic, philosophic and scientific works.

Dr. F. Rahman covers some of the same ground in his critical and historical investigation of the Muslim conception of Prophecy and Revelation, and its relation to orthodoxy and traditional Islam—*Prophecy in Islam* (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net). He, again, starts with Farabi and Avicenna and considers their attitudes to intellectual and imaginative revelation, miracles, magic, prayer, and their attempts to integrate the Muslim conception of Revelation with the Greek idea of Wisdom. On the whole the intellectualistic basis of the philosophical system though foreign to Islam was not entirely repudiated, but the orthodox tended to place reliance on the metaphysical use of language rather than on allegorization. The philosophic conceptions of religion as mere symbols cut at the roots of traditional Islam making an absolute separation and disengagement of the spirit and the letter of the law. 'The orthodox impulse is activist; it does not reject intellectualism but subordinates it to the end of moral dynamism.' Hence the tension between the Muslim and Hellenic traditions, which is ably demonstrated in this provocative volume.

In an introduction to the Islamic tradition in general terms the translation of Émile Dermenghem's small book—*Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition* (Longmans; 6s. net), in the 'Men of Wisdom' series—gives a concise and clear account of the life and call of Muhammad, the rise and spread of Islam, its fundamental principles, rites and sects, schools of thought and tendencies, together with extracts from the Qur'an and other Islamic texts. The illustrations are quite excellent and unusual.

E. O. JAMES

RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE

In his book, *An Analytical Philosophy of Religion* (Abingdon Press; $4.75), Dr. Willem F. Zuurdeeg has produced a large-scale study of religious language, using the approach of contemporary analytical philosophy. The author, who is now Associate Professor of Philosophy of Religion at McCormick Theological Seminary, was a student and then a pastor in the Netherlands during the Nazi occupation. He became dissatisfied with the customary theological denunciations of Nazism in high-sounding but ill-defined talk of 'divine laws' and so on. Making the acquaintance of the logical positivism of the Vienna Circle, he began to explore the possibility of an analytical approach to the present-day conflicts of ideologies.

The first part of his book is devoted to a careful study of what he calls 'convictional' language. Such language arises out of a 'convictional situation' in which man is overcome by a 'convictor'—this may be God, the *summum bonum*, the State, or something else. This convictional language is to be distinguished from the 'indicative' language of science and the 'tautological' language of mathematics. Dr. Zuurdeeg does not

fall into the mistake, not uncommon among logical empiricists, of trying to discuss language in a vacuum, as it were. 'Language is not only a terminology, a grammar . . . we should never lose sight of the man who speaks.' Thus linguistic analysis is to be supplemented by existential analysis.

There is an interesting chapter on the power of language. 'To speak is to exercise power.' Dr. Zuurdeeg shows us how man 'establishes his existence' through the languages which he uses. The anxiety which drives him to establish his existence may manifest itself in extreme form in fanatical language. Or we may see the connexion of language and power in the rivalries between different kinds of language—religious and scientific, religious and moral, scientific and moral, and many others. If you can persuade your opponent to talk with you in your language, you are already well on the way to gaining acceptance for your point of view.

The remainder of the book discusses various kinds of languages—metaphysical, mythical, moral and others—and the author has many interesting things to say. He expounds the views of a number of Dutch thinkers who are not widely known in this country, and in his antipathy to metaphysics has some sharp criticisms to make of Whitehead and Tillich. The point of view which emerges is 'compatible with some forms of Protestantism, perhaps with liberal Catholicism' but 'incompatible with fundamentalism, orthodoxy, and all forms of metaphysics.'

Whether the philosophy of religion can dispense with metaphysics and confine itself to the analysis of *homo loquens* is a big question which cannot be discussed here. But the exploration of the problems of religious language is in itself a most important subject, and Dr. Zuurdeeg's book is to be commended as an original and up-to-date contribution. It may be added that the book would have lost nothing if the author had written in a more flexible style and cut out some of the diagrams and charts.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

Understanding and Preventing Juvenile Delinquency, by Dr. Haskell M. Miller (Abingdon Press; $1.25), might be given as an alternative title, 'What every Christian ought to know about juvenile delinquency'. Dr. Miller, who is Head of the Department of Social Ethics at Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., has not written this book as a contribution to scientific study, but as an effort to bridge the gulf between the scientific disciplines involved in dealing with delinquency and the thinking and acting of churchmen about it. The opening chapters survey the facts and the findings of sociology upon them, while the later chapters discuss the treatment and prevention from a practical point of view, recording experiments and making suggestions for action by parents, concerned Christians and churches. The helpfulness of the book is scarcely affected by the fact that the background and examples are American. The author's clear style and wide knowledge inspire confidence.

'The purpose of a devotional commentary is to make better Christians out of Christians, to strengthen faith, to enlighten understanding, to quicken love, and to stir up wills.' Thus Dr. Carroll E. Simcox defines his objectives in the Preface to *They Met at Philippi: A Devotional Commentary on Philippians* (A. and C. Black; 9s. 6d. net); and, through the thoughtful chapters that follow, those purposes will certainly in some measure be achieved. Each section begins with a translation of the text; exegesis follows; and then, 'in a discursive meditation', the contemporary message is considered.

Draw Near with Faith, by the Rev. Allen Birtwhistle (Epworth Press; 6s. net), is concerned with three aspects of our religion—'the swing between doing and hearing the word; companionship, divine and human; and the indwelling of the Spirit.' The substance of this volume was given as lectures at various conferences and summer schools; and remains in a form very suitable for study groups and circles.

Mr. Birtwhistle writes with closely-reasoned argument and with a fascinating power to illustrate his argument from many sources. The nervous steward who invited to a meeting people 'of all sexes and *both ages*' spoke truer than he knew. The Christian lives in both ages. As Harnack said, Christianity means one thing, 'Eternal life in the midst of time.' Alfred the Great at the end of his *Blostman*, his Anthology, wrote: 'He seems to me a very foolish man, and very wretched, who will not increase his understanding, while he is in this world, and ever wish and long to reach that endless life where all shall be made clear.' The survivors of Hiroshima had the feeling that overnight they had passed from one period of history to another, from the pre-atomic to the atomic age. Those who had seen the Cross and who knew the Resurrection had the same feeling. In this world we have a foretaste—what Charles Wesley curiously called an *antepast* (from *ante*, before, and *pasco*, to feed)—of heaven, especially in the sacramental food. In the experience of this new life and in the hope of it the Christian must live, and the Christian hope is a certainty for it

is always hope ' in what God has done,' and in the end ' hope and faith will turn to sight.' This is only a very summary specimen of the treatment which Mr. Birtwhistle gives his great themes.

This is a book which will strengthen the faith of the reader, and, if he is a preacher or a teacher, it will help him to strengthen the faith of others.

Thoughts on Holy Communion, by the Rev. J. Ernest Rattenbury (Epworth Press ; 9s. 6d. net), is a short and readable book dealing with the history and meaning of Holy Communion. Its special emphasis derives from its author's desire to dispel the suspicion that sacramentalism is inconsistent with evangelism. He writes as an evangelist who has come to believe in the evangelical value of eucharistic worship. That point he is frequently able to illustrate by reference to the eucharistic hymns of the Wesleys—a subject on which he has previously written. Though differences of interpretation are not ignored, the tone is devotional rather than controversial, and the book may be warmly commended.

In *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, xvi. [1958], there is an interesting Biblical study entitled ' The Good Samaritan—The Good Shepherd ? ' (Gleerup, Lund), by Birger Gerhardsson. The writer discusses both the Parable of the Good Samaritan and the introductory conversation between Jesus and the lawyer in Lk 10^{25-29}. He recalls the widespread patristic interpretation which maintained that the Parable was intended by Jesus to refer to Himself, the Good Shepherd, and by means of an interesting study of the Hebrew words for ' neighbour ' and ' shepherd ' suggests that this exposition ' may have preserved, underneath its florid allegorising, the original sense of the parable, namely that its subject was Christ himself '. He suggests that the origin of the parable was a learned debate between Jesus and a scribe arising from the Scripture passages about loving God and loving one's neighbour, a debate conducted in Hebrew, and he supports this claim by pointing out that the rabbis are never so keen to use a parable as when they are expounding a passage of Scripture. The reader may doubt whether this ingenious suggestion can be sustained, but he will certainly admit that Gerhardsson has stated an argument not easy to answer.

The Recovery of Man in Childhood, by Mr. A. C. Harwood (Hodder and Stoughton ; 21s. net), forms a good introduction to the educational work of Rudolf Steiner, which has already resulted in the foundation of about sixty schools in all parts of the world educating some thirty thousand children. Mr. Harwood describes the curriculum and teaching methods of these schools and endeavours to show how they are based on Steiner's conception of the world and of man as being both essentially spiritual in nature and origin. The book is enriched with many practical illustrations drawn from a long teaching experience and a deep understanding of children.

Parents and teachers who may have difficulty with Steiner's teaching, generally known as anthroposophy, ought not to neglect this book ; while any reader to whom the Austrian philosopher, scientist and seer is as yet but a name, will find an easy approach to some of Steiner's characteristic ideas by taking Mr. Harwood as guide.

Residue of Days : A Confession of Faith, by Mr. Hugh Redwood (Hodder and Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net), is at once a spiritual autobiography and one man's exposition of the faith which he has discovered for himself. In describing his early religious experience Mr. Redwood says : ' Now I had a genuine joy in believing that I was saved. But it was the joy of some one rescued from a danger unrealized to a safety imperfectly apprehended. I might have been drowned, I was safely on shore—but I still could not swim '. This book takes us through the stages of its writer's deeper and deeper personal grasp of Christ and understanding of Christian truth until he came to the abiding faith which he now possesses and which possesses him.

From one point of view it would be easy to differ violently from the point of view of this book. It is not altogether easy to accept a view of prayer at one and the same time as the means of deliverance from deadly illness and the clearing of fog on the road on a late motor-car journey. It is—at least for some of us—impossible even to imagine that, when Jesus spoke of a day when men's hearts would be *failing them for fear*, He was foretelling the literal heart-failure due to the modern prevalence of thrombosis. In this matter we quote Mr. Redwood's argument as a curiosity of exegesis. (1) The large number of sudden deaths from heart-failure due to thrombosis is one of the phenomena of our time. (2) Fear is popularly said ' to curdle the blood '. (3) The word thrombosis is Greek for a *curd* or *clot*. (4) The Greek word which is translated *failing* is one that means *giving out*, which is precisely what the heart does, when the flow of blood is stopped by a clot.

But, when all the criticisms and reservations have been made, the fact remains that this is a book by a writer whose own faith will stimulate the faith of others.

'Talking effectively to youth, in the name of Christ, is one of the tougher assignments any Christian evangelist can take on'. So says Mr. Leonard Barnett, author of *Talking to Youth* (National Sunday School Union; 7s. 6d. net), but from long experience of apparently 'hard-boiled young pagans' he is convinced that the majority of them are by no means inaccessible, and that a well-conducted Epilogue at the end of the Club evening can get something across. In his book he offers some of the fruits of his experience in the shape of fifty scripts for five-minute talks to teenagers. Mr. Barnett's own very notable career as a leader of work among young people would be in itself a sufficient commendation of his book, even without Dr. Leslie Weatherhead's enthusiastic Foreword; and even a cursory glance at one or two of the talks is enough to show that an expert is on the job.

To youth-leaders who feel that the Epilogue, consisting of worship *and* a brief 'message', is their most important opportunity, but who find it very difficult to speak about the Christian faith in language that young people will readily understand and respond to, this book could provide invaluable material. And ministers, looking for fresh approaches and fresh illustrations, would find it a real treasure-house.

Hard Facts, by Mr. John Lawrence (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is a stimulating little book. It compels the reader to face up to certain great demanding questions—the atomic bomb, the dwindling food supply of a world in which population is fast increasing, the place of Britain in the world, the internal problems of our own country, the Christian in public life, and the Church as the pattern for society.

At the end of his first chapter Mr. Lawrence writes: 'I am not so much concerned to persuade others that my views on the best policy are right as to persuade them to start thinking without panic about various possible forms of atomic warfare as an inescapable Christian duty.' The attractive thing about this book is in fact its demand that the Christian should think for himself. This book does not present facile and ready-made solutions; but it does demand that the problems should be faced.

Mr. Lawrence is specially wise on the Christian and his duty in public life. 'There is no contracting out. We must plunge into the affairs of the world, or most of us must, but we must not make a religion of activism. We are in the world and in one sense we belong to the world, but we must not forget that the source of life and strength comes from beyond the world. An active life becomes arid unless it is continually nourished by prayer and by regular times of withdrawal. It is easy to forget that.' Mr. Lawrence sees it to be the duty of the Christian to be the leaven in the Welfare State. 'Two things are needed to transform the Welfare State. One is to turn every working group into a true fellowship. The other is to see through the files and forms in triplicate to God's creatures who are at the other end of the chain of organization.' That is well and wisely said.

This book will be of real value in enabling the individual Christian to clarify his own thinking, and in providing discussion groups with excellent material from which to start. It bravely and honestly presents the challenge of Christian living within the world.

Stories for Children's Services, by the Rev. Nick Earle (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net), is a book born out of practical necessity. Every Sunday Mr. Earle had to face a large group of children, whose ages ranged from seven to thirteen. This book contains a children's talk for each Sunday for a year. The book follows the Christian year. It is divided into ten sections—The Coming of Jesus, Old Testament Heroes, The Temptations of Jesus, Jesus Meets His Disciples, The Lord's Prayer, The Words of Jesus, Learning to Pray, The Works of Jesus, The Weapons of a Christian, Christian Heroes.

These stories are not just stories; each is used to drive home a point of doctrine or a lesson from the Bible. Mr. Earle quotes the saying that all good advertising is ninety per cent sugar and ten per cent pill; and then says that the same principle can be applied to all preaching, and especially to preaching to children! 'This book', Mr. Earle modestly claims, 'is an attempt to provide . . . the example, the illustration, and the narrative to coat the doctrinal pill'.

Mr. Earle draws his material from many spheres. He is by no means least effective when he is drawing on personal experience. 'When I was eight years old', he writes, 'I used to be given pocket-money—threepence a week. I didn't have to work for it or earn it in any way. But there was one thing I did have to do. I had to ask my Dad for it. Saturday was the day he gave it to me and if I forgot to ask on Saturday, I went without it all the week'. Then Mr. Earle goes on to show how no gift of man or God must be taken for granted.

Mr. Earle writes with verve and with admirable simplicity. Good books of children's talks are not easy to come by; and this book combines entertainment and instruction in exactly correct proportions.

Milestones in Books. V.

By the Reverend Canon J. E. Fison, M.A., D.D., Truro[1]

'If I have been taught nothing else of great importance, I have been taught to think' (G. F. Barbour, *The Life of Alexander Whyte*, 78)—that is Alexander Whyte's testimony to the importance of his college days at Aberdeen University. And it seems to me that the *first milestone*, that I should record, ought to mention three books which made me think, even though I did not understand them to begin with at all.

I remember the French Grammar in which I got stuck in two consecutive terms at the verbs *devoir*, *vouloir* and *savoir*. Then, later on, there was Kant's *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Ethics* in T. K. Abbott's translation. I strongly suspect, after looking up my copy, that I never got beyond p. 38, but I shall never forget the mental effort required even to get thus far. Finally, in a similar category I must mention Dr. Marcus Gregory's *Psychotherapy : Scientific and Religious*. I helped to write the synopsis of each chapter, though I was entirely out of my depth in the subject. In my view books, that are difficult and uncongenial and from which at the time we read them we apparently derive no benefit, may do us more good mentally than those from which we consciously benefit much more.

My *second milestone* was vividly recalled to my mind a month or two ago, when Truro Cathedral Drama Guild gave a performance of the modern play, *The Holly and the Ivy*, by Wynyard Browne. To my utter amazement I heard myself speaking in the person of the Rev. Martin Gregory: 'South America's always had a fascination for me, ever since I first read Prescott—" The Conquest of Peru "—that's a wonderful book now. . . . That was the first time I had ever realized the size of human history' (p. 16). That was exactly my experience, only it was not so much *The Conquest of Peru* as an abridged edition in a limp blue cover of *The Conquest of Mexico* that did the trick for me. It had the sort of effect on me, as a schoolboy, that an occasional dose of Professor Arnold Toynbee produces to-day—a sort of re-birth, caused by looking at things from a new angle. And how I sympathized with Guatemoc (or was it Guatemozin in Prescott ?) and with Atahualpha, the last of the Incas about whom 'every schoolboy knows' (so Macaulay, as I well remember) ! And how I hated Cortes and Pizarro !

So much for school days—what of the university ? It now seems to me as if the *third milestone* did not so much open up a new era as register the end of an old one. After I went down from Oxford, Amy Carmichael's *Gold Cord* gathered up into a unity the fragments of Evangelical and missionary piety, upon which my soul fed most deeply at that time. I was not convinced until much later—at a retreat in Jerusalem in 1944—that there was any Catholic piety that could match the sort of Evangelical piety which I knew in my youth, and to which *Gold Cord* seemed to me to give almost perfect expression.

Though I have since read with great profit *The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman* and listened with rapt attention to Professor Allison Peers lecturing on S. John of the Cross, I am still not persuaded that the Catholic tradition offers a higher type of spirituality. Rather, I feel it is often straining after something which Evangelical piety can so banally and tragically miss altogether, but which it can also touch occasionally with an apparent effortlessness, which is as nearly Christlike as anything I have ever known. Even Cecily Hallack's stroke of creative genius, *The Happiness*

[1] J. E. Fison was born in Hereford in 1906. He was educated at Shrewsbury School, and the Queen's College, Oxford where he read Classics and where, in 1930, he took a first class in Theology. Then for three years he taught in a Mission School in Cairo. Ordained deacon and priest in 1934 he went to Wycliffe Hall, Oxford as tutor and chaplain. During the War he was for four years a chaplain in the Army, and as Senior Chaplain in Jerusalem he was able to study closely contemporary Arab and Jewish life. After the War he was a Canon of Rochester Cathedral until 1952 when he became Rector of St. Mary's Church, Truro and Sub-Dean and Canon Residentiary of Truro Cathedral. Now he is Canon and Chancellor-designate of Lincoln, where he expects to go after Easter.

During *Kirk Week* at Aberdeen in 1957 he gave three stimulating Bible Studies and there was widespread pleasure, when, in the summer of 1958, an Honorary D.D. was conferred on him by the University of Aberdeen.

He has published a number of scholarly books with a wide appeal :—*The Blessing of the Holy Spirit* (1950) ; *Understanding the Old Testament* (1952) ; *The Christian Hope* (1954) ; *The Faith of the Bible*, a Pelican Book (1957) ; *Fire Upon the Earth* (1958).

of Father Happé, does not seem to me to surpass the spirit of Amy Carmichael's introductory poem :

> From prayer that asks that I may be
> Sheltered from winds that beat on Thee,
> From fearing when I should aspire,
> From faltering when I should climb higher,
> From silken self, O Captain, free
> Thy soldier who would follow Thee.
>
> From subtle love of softening things,
> From easy choices, weakenings,
> (Not thus are spirits fortified,
> Not this way went the Crucified)
> From all that dims Thy Calvary,
> O Lamb of God, deliver me.
>
> Give me the love that leads the way,
> The faith that nothing can dismay,
> The hope no disappointments tire,
> The passion that will burn like fire,
> Let me not sink to be a clod :
> Make me Thy fuel, Flame of God.

When I move on to the *fourth milestone*, I become conscious of my more direct theological indebtedness. Of many Biblical commentaries, which have helped me, I must select George Adam Smith's justly famous works—*The Book of Isaiah* and *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*. I shall never forget lecturing at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, at the height of the Abyssinian crisis in 1936 on Hosea. I came across George Adam Smith's description of Israel as a ' half-baked bannock ' (commenting on Hos 7^{8}), and I applied it with some emphasis to the British foreign policy of the time, thus incurring the wrath of an ex-Army officer in the front row of my audience of ordinands. He closed his Bible with a bang and kept it closed for the rest of the lecture. I still think George Adam Smith's point and my application of it were good, but I dare say the way I put it across was quite insufferable !

If George Adam Smith for the first time co-ordinated my heart and mind in Old Testament study, I think T. W. Manson did the same for the New Testament, but for my *fifth milestone* I should prefer to choose a book that opened up an entirely new range of interest to me. Dom Gregory Dix' *The Shape of the Liturgy* was brought out during the War to Jerusalem by the American Chaplain at St. George's Anglican Cathedral. I was stationed in Jerusalem at the time as an Army Chaplain, responsible for conducting tours round the Holy Land and for trying to interpret the various liturgies of the ancient churches of the Holy City.

There had been an occasion ten or twelve years earlier, when I was staying with my old Principal, Dr. Graham Brown, then Bishop in Jerusalem, when a group of Presbyterian ordinands arrived and I heard the Bishop advise them over the telephone to go and see for themselves some of the ancient liturgies. I remember my unspoken comment, ' Surely the Bishop, as a good Evangelical, cannot really believe those ancient liturgies are any good ! '

Ten years later out came Dom Gregory Dix' wonderful book to Jerusalem ! I borrowed it and read it twice. I was predisposed in its favour because as a matter of history and exegesis I agreed with Dix' interpretation both of the original ' Do this in remembrance of me ' (Jesus was instituting no new rite, but investing an old rite with new meaning) and also of Cranmer's thoroughly Protestant intention in *The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion*. But what made *The Shape of the Liturgy* a milestone for me was not so much its scholarly distinction as its enthusiasm. It transmitted the thrill of a eucharistically centred church worship such as I had never experienced or read about before. In particular, the short ch. 6 on ' The Pre-Nicene Background of the Liturgy ' seemed to me to be quite irresistible.

And so I come to my *sixth milestone*, and it must be my last, for space would fail me to tell of Oman and Otto, Dorothy Sayers and Dr. F. W. Dillistone. For the sixth book I must select Dr. Martin Buber's *Moses*. Perhaps because I got to know Professor Buber personally during the War, when he spoke ' to my condition ' in a peculiar and decisive way, I have been very greatly influenced by his books. In *Moses* he seems to me to write about the deepest reality of religion, as I know it, and to make coherent sense of it to me in a way no one else has done. If George Adam Smith showed me how Old Testament religion can be applied, Martin Buber opened my eyes to what it is. Whether his exegesis of Ex 3^{14} is sound or not, ' I shall be there as he who I there shall be ' is superb in its demolition at one stroke of any mere subjective receptionism and of any mere objective ritualism. ' If the first part of the statement states : " I do not need to be conjured, for I am always with you ", the second adds : "but it is impossible to conjure me" ' (p. 52 f.). And can any one produce a better theory of the origin of human speech and language than the almost inarticulate wonder of the aboriginal exclamation, ' He ! ' ?

I have said enough to expose my own immaturity. How many more milestones I shall be granted to pass I do not know. But this I do know ; the way forward does not look less exciting, but more ; it does not look less difficult, but more ; it does not look less dangerous, but more. Whatever other characteristics my little *Pilgrim's Progress* may so far have had, I hope my first six milestones make it clear that boredom has certainly not been one of them.

'That They All May Be One' (John xvii. 21)—and the Unity of the Church

By the Reverend T. Evan Pollard, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Woollahra, New South Wales

In a recent article in *New Testament Studies* (iii. [1957] 334–349) I endeavoured to demonstrate how Jn 10^{30}, 'I and the Father are one', played a major rôle in the Church's formation of the doctrine of the Trinity. Hippolytus of Rome, Tertullian, Novatian and Athanasius all found in this text the paradoxical concept of *distinction-within-unity* which is central in the doctrine. The Arians tried to evade the issues which this text raised by interpreting it in the light of Jn $17^{11.\ 20-23}$; they asserted that the unity of Father and Son is of the same kind as that which the redeemed have with one another. In reply, Athanasius clearly demonstrated the error of this method of interpretation by a careful examination of the language of Jn $17^{11.\ 20-23}$, pointing out that in each of the three places (*vv.* 11, 21, 22–23) where Jesus prays for the unity of His disciples with one another, the unity is compared with a higher unity, the unity of the Father and the Son:

v. 11: 'that they may be one, *as we are.*'

v. 21: 'that they all may be one; *even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us.*'

v. 22–23: 'that they may be one, *even as we are one, I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one.*'

Therefore, says Athanasius, the unity of believers with one another must be compared with the higher unity of Father and Son, and not *vice versa*.

It has been suggested to me that this interpretation by Athanasius may throw light on the use of Jn 17^{21}, 'that they all may be one', in discussions concerning Church Union and Church Unity. On the level of debates in Church Courts and of interdenominational discussions on the question of the union of churches—an important question in Australia at the present time when negotiations for the Union of Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian Churches are in an advanced stage—Jn 17^{21} is frequently quoted, but never interpreted in the light of its immediate context nor in the light of the whole Gospel. The ardent protagonists of Union quote it as if it were the final sanction or even the absolute command of our Lord that the churches, as we know them in this twentieth century, should unite. On the academic level, as far as I can discover from a limited acquaintance with the mass of literature on the question of the unity of the Church, Jn 17^{21} is frequently quoted, but never interpreted in the light of the higher unity explicitly stated in Jn 10^{30}. If we begin with Athanasius' rule for the interpretation of these verses—a rule which I take to be valid—the falseness of the popular use of Jn 17^{21} becomes quite evident, but more important than that, we are led on to what may be called 'a trinitarian approach to the doctrine of the unity of the Church'.

In the first place, it must be emphasized that Jn 17 is a prayer for the unity of the disciples of Christ. There is no mention of church or churches. It is only by inference or extension, which may or may not be valid, that the prayer can be applied to the Church. Obvious though this fact is to any reader of the Fourth Gospel, in discussions on Church Unity or Church Union it is generally ignored. Supposing, however, that we accept the assumption that the prayer, as a prayer for the unity of the disciples, is also, by implication, a prayer for the unity of the Church, what do the words 'that they all may be one' mean? Do they mean, as the protagonists of Church Union assume, that Christ is praying that there may be one Church, in the sense of one all-inclusive organization? A close examination of Jn 17 proves that such an interpretation is erroneous.

I have already pointed out that in each of the three places in Jn 17 where Jesus prays for the unity of His disciples, He qualifies this unity by comparing it with the unity which He has with the Father. If we would know, then, what is the nature of the unity which Christ prays that His disciples may have, we have to look beyond it to the unity which He has with His Father. It cannot be doubted that in these verses there is a reference back to Jn 10^{30}, 'I and the Father are one'. The interpretation of Jn $17^{11.\ 20-23}$ depends, as Athanasius made quite clear, on the interpretation of the unity mentioned in Jn 10^{30}. The Early Church found in this far-reaching claim of Jesus the key with which to unlock the secrets of the relationship between the Father and the Son. In it was found the assertion of the distinction between the Father and the Son, which the Sabellians denied, and also the assertion of the unity of the Father and the Son which the Arians

denied. The unity of the Father and the Son is a unity in which there are ' personal ' or ' hypostatic ' distinctions. This is the kind of unity which is the pattern or protype of the unity of Christ's disciples.

If we are prepared to apply Jn 17^{21} to the unity of the Church, then we have to postulate a unity in which there are distinctions and allow for *distinction-within-unity*. This type of unity is explicit in the Pauline doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ—' one body, many members '. It is this idea of unity which made it possible to speak of *One Church* in the era of the Fathers, when each Church was autonomous, yet all were united in the one Church of Jesus Christ. The unity of the Church is a *unity-with-distinctions*. To argue for uniformity or for union of churches in one Church with one form of government, worship, etc., is to take a Sabellian view of the unity of the Church which is just as unbiblical as the Sabellian view of the unity of the Godhead.

At the same time it is equally possible and equally unbiblical to take an Arian view of the Church by so emphasizing the distinctions that the unity of the Church is lost. Close attention to the whole of Jn 17^{21} safeguards us against this danger; Christ prays, ' that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us '. It is integral to John's doctrine of the unity of the Father and the Son that Father and Son interpenetrate each other, a concept to which the Church was later to give the technical name of ' perichoresis ' or ' circumincessio '. In Jn 17^{21} Jesus applies this idea to the unity of the disciples. Perichoresis is part of the meaning of the unity of the Church, and it has important consequences for the doctrine of the unity of the Church. The unity of the Church is such that within it there are distinctions and at the same time perichoresis—mutual interpenetration. Any Church which stands apart by itself and refuses to participate in the movement of perichoresis within the unity of the Church is guilty of the heresy of Arianism, which denies the unity by over-emphasizing the distinctions.

What form does this perichoresis take within the unity of the Church ? Part of the answer must surely be ' inter-communion and mutual recognition and inter-change of ministries '. Within this view of the unity of the Church the questions of validity of orders and confirmation become of only secondary importance. Within the unity of the Church there must be distinctions, each ' church ' with its own distinctive place within the economy of the *One Church* and all sharing in its common life.

If this exegesis of Jn 17^{21} is valid, its use in arguments in favour of Church Union is completely invalid. It may at times become convenient for ' churches ' to unite; there may be cases where distinctions between ' churches ' are invalid or where, through the passing of time or through the missionary situation in which the ' churches ' are set, the distinctions have become meaningless and a hindrance to the Church's mission. In such cases and at such times let those churches unite by all means, but let us stop trying to bolster up our arguments in favour of such unions by false exegesis of the High-Priestly Prayer of our Lord.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Four of the Clock

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

' But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard '.—Ac 4^{19-20} (R.V.).

You have been to the shop with a long list of groceries. The man behind the counter has taken your list, loaded up the things in your basket, made out your bill, and you have dragged the lot home. Then, when you start to take the packets out, you find that he has put in *two* pounds of sugar instead of the one your mother ordered and you paid for. What happens next ?

I don't know what happens next in your household. But I know what ought to happen. However far it is back to the shop, however soon you want to be on the football field, however much it was the man's fault and not yours, you ought to go back with that two-pound parcel.

When the bus conductor collecting fares misses your seat, what do you do ? And when you have a letter delivered with a stamp which has missed the franking machine, what do you do with it ? Destroy it, because it has already done its job ? Good, I thought you would, since you belong to Christ's band of followers.

But the other morning in school the maths. master was unduly sceptical when so many of you got that equation right for homework. ' How many of you had any help with this at home ? ' he asked. It had been a snorter, and Dad had given you a hint which had helped you to get it out. Probably other people's Dads had done their stuff, too. Your eye sneaked quickly round the class. Not a single hand was up. ' Nobody had any help at all ? ' came that suspicious voice again.

What happened to your hand? Did it still stay down?

If you have a clock in a tower in your town, or in the post office, the odds are that it has Roman figures. You know: they used letters instead of numerals—I and V and X. Shut your eyes and picture the figures. One o'clock is one I; two o'clock is two Is; three o'clock is three Is. Four o'clock is—IV. Are you sure? Take a look and see. You'll find it is IIII—four Is. Do you know why?

In 1370 King Charles V of France sent for his court clock-maker and ordered him to make a fine clock. Old Henri de Vick worked with all his skill until the clock was ready to present to the King. The King looked at the figure four—IV. 'That's wrong,' he said. 'Wrong, Your Majesty?' 'Yes, indeed. It should be four Is.' 'Oh, no, Your Majesty,' began de Vick. But in those bad old days it was not wise to argue with kings. 'Take it away', shouted the King, 'and bring the clock back with four Is, as I tell you—or else . . .' The clock-maker knew that a Roman four should be IV; but because of that 'or else . . .' he altered a right thing and made it wrong. And thousands of clock-makers have copied that same mistake.

That is not one of the world's famous stories, because it is about a man who dared not stand up for what he knew to be right. If you read the stories of the early Christians—Ignatius and Polycarp and Perpetua—you will learn of those who were quite sure that loyalty to truth was worth more than life.

When Jesus was a boy, He must have been told a finer story than our clock tale. It wasn't a historical story, but it had been written to nerve the Jews to stand firm when the Greeks tried to break their faith in what was right. It went something like this: 'Once upon a time, when a pagan king tried to make the Jews give up their religion and become like the rest of his subjects, there was a young Jew who would not obey. . . .' But you can read the tale for yourself. It is the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament.

People like 'Daniel', Joan of Arc, Latimer and Ridley and (in our own century) Martin Niemöller and Bishop Berggraev have known what was right in the sight of God; and they have done it.

God's Mirror

By The Reverend John R. Gray, V.R.D., B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

God . . . hath . . . spoken unto us by his Son, . . . the express image of his person'.—He 1 [1, 2, 3].

Anything you can do, I can do better,
I can do anything better than you.

So runs a song very popular not so long ago. But it is not true. I am not very old, but already there are lots of things you, boys and girls, can do better than me. Indeed, there are some things you can do I cannot do at all. I cannot ride a fairy cycle any more, nor skip up a steep hill, nor play rugby football. I can't even make a hula hoop go round—at least not oftener than two or three times. There is something else you can do—some one whom you can see—whom all of you here can see—every one in church—except me. Do you know who that is? It is myself. I cannot see me, not, that is, unless there is a mirror in the pulpit, which there is not.

There's some one else here, whom I cannot see, nor you either. You know who that is, don't you? God Himself. No man has seen God at any time, not face to face at any rate, but He has given us a mirror in which we may look upon Him and learn of Him. That mirror is Jesus Christ. In Him, in His life and teaching and death, we may learn what God is like. If we have ears to hear, God will speak to us too by His Son, the express image of His Person.

The Christian Year

Second Sunday in Lent

A Colony of Heaven

By The Reverend A. J. Boyd, O.B.E., D.D., Glasgow

'Our citizenship is in heaven'.—Ph 3[20] (R.V.).

So St. Paul says; but Christian people of our day think about heaven, or at any rate talk about heaven, far less than in any previous Christian age. Christians no doubt still cherish the Christian hope, but it seems to have been tacitly agreed that it is no longer expedient, or no longer in good taste, to say very much *about* heaven, as a goal of Christian aspiration.

Why this widespread distaste for what is contemptuously described as 'otherworldly religion'?

1. It is partly, no doubt, because of the feeling that some forms of Victorian piety brought discredit on the faith by representing Christian salvation as hardly more than admission to heaven or escape from hell, with but little reference to our here and now, as if this present world were merely a sort of waiting-room in which we could conveniently compose our thoughts in preparation for the summons to what lay beyond. That emphasis certainly needed correction.

2. But we need to go deeper. Must we not say that the change of emphasis in Christian thinking is mainly due to the weakening of faith in a living, reigning God? Whatever Christians themselves believe, the man in the street has banished heaven from the working vocabulary of his thought; and Christian teachers, anxious to meet him where he is, have recognized that he is apparently not very

much interested in heaven, and so make as little reference as possible to this awkward subject. But what *is* heaven? Although we can't help speaking and thinking about it as if it were a place, we know that it means God's power, unobscured and uncontradicted. Heaven is God's reign manifest and unchallenged. And if that conception has become unreal to people in general, it is mainly because their thinking and imagining have not really been determined by belief in a living, reigning God. With little thought of a God who is above the world, people in general have naturally had little thought of a heaven which is beyond it; they have been content to settle down and make themselves as much at home as possible in *this* world, 'in which', says Wordsworth, 'we find our happiness, or not at all'. And many of us Christian people have rushed more than half-way to meet them, singing hymns about a heaven which is

Not throned above the skies
Nor golden-walled afar

—as if anybody had ever supposed that these were the all-important things about heaven!—and sometimes almost confessing the belief that the only heaven anyone is likely ever to see is a heaven upon earth.

St. Paul says 'our citizenship is in heaven'. Is that a mere hollow echo from a past whose language is no longer understood because its thinking is no longer relevant? We need to remind ourselves, perhaps, that it has been the language of all Christian centuries except our own. It is, of course, the language of the New Testament as a whole. 'Strangers and pilgrims on earth'. 'Here we have no continuing city'. Throughout the New Testament, life on this earth is conceived as a race, or a warfare. or a journeying towards some better country which is our true home. And do we not too readily assume that we have outgrown such ideas? Are we not rather failing to rise to the height they reached? It is the language also of the whole Middle Ages. Mortal man is 'man upon a journey', 'wayfaring man', a pilgrim and a traveller on the earth, his home 'heaven's high city'. And in Renaissance days, when, for so many, the wonders of this present world and the adventure of this present life were an intoxication and a passion, even then the great poets and adventurers—perhaps because they *were* great poets and adventurers—seldom forgot that they were men upon a journey, bound for 'a country far beyond the stars'. And after them came Bunyan with his Pilgrim. And, in the so-called Age of Reason, such a man as Dr. Johnson, so full of zest for the friendly things of this familiar world, but never long unmindful of that other world to which he was a traveller. In the nineteenth century the Church as a whole was still faithful to the tradition—perhaps in some quarters too narrowly faithful to it. It is only in these latter years that it has come to be thought too naïve, and even unhealthy, to be consciously a stranger and pilgrim on the earth. It was only the day before yesterday that even many within the Church began to have their doubts about singing 'Heaven is my home'.

3. Within the Church itself, the tactful silence about heaven is partly due—is it not?—to the fear that if our emphasis were too otherworldly we might fail to commend the gospel to those to whom the joys and the adventures and the opportunities of this present world are a delight and a challenge. That is a very respectable fear; we have all known people whose preoccupation with heaven's joys caused them to be curiously hostile to the healthy interests that this world has to offer. But perhaps we have been too much afraid of this error, and have impoverished our witness to the gospel. Do we not, after all, know very well that the man who has most joy of this life is the man whose soul is free from bondage to it, because his final loyalty is to a better country which is in the heavens? In his happiness there is a clearness and a keenness that the earthbound cannot know. He responds more sensitively to all experience. You remember Philip Sidney, that glowing spirit who, as if remembering 'the time of life is short', crowded into so few years so much honour, so much achievement, so much keen joy. When we read his lines on 'Him who seeketh Heaven', we begin to understand the secret of his high-heartedness.

4. And has the modern silence about heaven been partly due to the fear that the Church might seem indifferent—or *be* indifferent—to the *ugly* facts of life as we now know it, and might be behindhand in the struggle for a juster social order? Again a very respectable fear. Most of us are acutely conscious of the Communist caricature of religion, as a disease which casts a heavy sleep upon men's social conscience, causing them to dream, and in their dreams to mumble of a better, happier world far, far away. We do well to be sensitive to that criticism, by far the most aggressive, if not the most profoundly searching, that we have to face to-day. But we need not on that account try to trim the gospel to the critics' taste. And if it is true that there have been Christians, most religious souls, whose preoccupation with the next world rendered them strangely insensitive to the evils and injustices of this present world, there have been hosts of others whose passion to serve this world, and whose understanding of this world's real needs, were the direct outcome of their consciousness of being citizens, and colonists, of heaven. And that is what one would expect.

It was that sort of connexion between heaven

and earth that St. Paul had in mind when he wrote to the Philippian Christians, 'our citizenship is in heaven'. Dr. Moffatt's translation, 'we are a colony of heaven', perhaps conveys best what was in the Apostle's mind. He was writing to a little group of Christian people in the Roman colony of Philippi, planted by the Emperor Augustus there on the highway between East and West, to be a centre of Roman influence and a bulwark of Roman power. Most of the Christians would not themselves be Roman citizens; they may have felt themselves looked down upon by the proud Roman colonists, and perhaps they were not all as proudly conscious as they might have been of what it means to be a Christian. At any rate, St. Paul reminds them that they too are colonists; they too, with all their fellow-Christians upon earth, are members of a colony far greater than any that a Roman Emperor could found—a colony of heaven. And that is how we are to interpret the meaning of our Christian citizenship. We, with the whole Church on earth, are a colony of heaven, set here by Christ to glorify His name and serve His purposes, looking with love and longing—but with no vain, homesick repining—to that heavenly city where he reigns in glory, inspired by His Spirit to ever greater faithfulness in the tasks to which He has set us here. Our consciousness of heavenly citizenship can never, if we rightly understand its meaning, dull our interest in this world's needs and strivings, or distract us from this life's tasks and duties; for it is on earth that the King of Heaven calls us to serve Him, and earth and heaven alike are His.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT

The People of God

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL NORMAN H. SNAITH, D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS

'Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people'.—Ex 19[5].

'A peculiar treasure'. The phrase elsewhere is 'a peculiar people'. It is strange how words change their meaning. The modern usage in the sense of 'odd, queer' and even 'slightly mad' is a long way from Biblical usage, where the word is used in the sense of the Latin *peculiaris*, 'belonging particularly to oneself'.

The use of the word 'peculiar' of the Hebrew people represents that unique relationship which they maintained existed between God and Israel. They believed that all the earth was His, for He made it. They believed that all the peoples on earth were His in that He gave them breath and life. But they believed that Israel belonged to Him because He was their Saviour who rescued them out of slavery in Egypt. He was Creator of all, but Saviour of Israel. The ancient Jewish Sabbath canticle (Dt 32) has it: 'The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance'. No other people belonged to Him like that.

1. *How did they come to be His people?* The answer is not that they chose Him, but that He chose them. It began out in the western desert—which was not a barren desert, but the kind of half-desert you can see in parts of the Deccan; a country desperately short of water, but with enough grass to feed sheep and goats if you keep moving and are in the right places at the right times. A flock of sheep and goats, indistinguishable except for tails up or tails down; the shepherd sitting under a rock and keeping a general eye on the whole flock, stirring only if one animal strays too far. And Moses, squatting there on a scorching afternoon sees a bush that burns but does not burn away. 'Off with your sandals: this is holy ground'. It is God: God come down to rescue this race of slaves, to turn them into a people, His people, the People of God. He chose them: they did not choose Him—and they read this back into the history of their fathers: this God chose Jacob, chose Isaac, chose Abraham and called him out from Ur of the Chaldees, so that he went out not knowing whither he went, but wholly confident that when he got there, he would know.

This same insistence has come right down into Christianity. He chose us: we did not choose Him: and the more we know of His saving grace and of His enabling grace, the more certainly we know that this is true. We know that we owe everything to God's grace. When a man becomes a Christian he is conscious at that time that it is his own choice; but my experience is that the older he grows, the more he grows up as a Christian, the more he is convinced that even those first stirrings in his heart which prompted him to become a Christian (to choose Christ) were the workings of the Holy Spirit. The full, mature Christian doctrine is that we owe everything to God's grace, at the first, now and always, right on to the end.

2. *Why did He choose them?* What was there in them that influenced Him in His choice? The answer is 'Nothing; nothing at all'. It used to be the fashion a generation ago to say—the Greeks had a genius for beauty: the Romans had a genius for law: the Hebrews had a genius for religion—by 'genius' I suppose we mean a quality, a characteristic which was given them: even though they may have developed it, the germ was there to start with. Would anybody who knows anything about the Hebrews say nowadays that they had a genius for religion? Recent discoveries in Palestine confirm all that the prophets have said—their only genius for religion consisted in turning aside to other religions—away to the gods of the

land, with fertility ceremonies, poojahs of every kind, shrines and offering and temple-girls as in Hindu temples. Those that held to the true religion were—once more as the prophets have said—a small group, and often, indeed mostly, the priests and the cult-prophets were the leaders in apostasy. They had no special genius for religion, none of them except the prophets whom God Himself picked and chose. The reasons for God's choice are sought for again and again : you get them in Dt 7, 8 and 9—not because they were many (they were not many, they were few) : not because they were rich (they were not rich)—Palestine was always too poor a country and never enough rainfall to be fertile apart from a continual influx of American Jewish money. It was not because of anything they were or had done or possessed.

3. The last question is : *For what purpose did He choose them* ? It is a question that is often asked : Why do you say that God chose one people, and not all peoples ? Why did He make favourites of the Hebrews ? Surely God's mercy must be for all men, without distinction of race or colour or home or circumstances.

The answer is : if God's choice of Israel was an end in itself, then the charge of favouritism would stick : and this is, indeed, the charge which can be levelled against the Judaism of the fourth and third centuries : the time of Nehemiah and Ezra and of the Chronicler. But the word of the prophets is otherwise : with Is 49^6 as the *locus classicus* : 'And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel : I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth'. This was the hidden purpose of Israel's trials : Israel was made into a sharpened sword, hardened and tempered in the fire and water of affliction, and all the time hidden under the shadow of God's hand, till 'now, saith the Lord, that formed me from the womb to be his servant'. Or in a modern setting : Suppose you want to run a scout troop, how do you start ? Fling wide the doors and invite all and sundry to come in ? That is silly : your only result will be to have the whole place smashed up. No : the way to start a scout troop is to begin six months before you start : to begin with a selected half-dozen of picked boys. Then, when these are trained, then is the time to start. You have your patrol leaders and you can open the doors. That is what God was doing when He chose the Jews : they were to be His tool, the tool whereby He could win all men. This also is another strand that has come down into Christianity. He has chosen us, not simply that we shall meet together in worship and maintain that worship, but that we shall be His witnesses that through us this gospel shall spread. No Church —no communion, no confession—must be content simply to be itself : that is not what the Church is for. The light that is put under the bushel goes out.

The tragedy of the Judaism of those centuries was that it turned in on itself. It came to think that being a peculiar treasure meant that it had to separate itself in order to keep itself safe. The Jewry of those centuries ceased to fulfil its function as the People of God.

Peculiar treasure. There is one way certainly in which to the West the Christian is 'peculiar treasure'. When we think of treasure, we think of something that is kept from sight : it is hoarded. I spent the larger part of last year in South India : they tell me that Indian treasure means chains and bangles and cloth of gold embroidered with jewels ; the Indian woman wears her wealth. The Maharajah on all State occasions glittered with it, and still he retains much of the ancient splendour. That is what treasure is for, not to be hidden in darkness, but flashed in the sun. This Christian treasure is not to be stored away, to be kept secret, to be hoarded—this peculiar treasure, God's treasured people, is to be spent freely, to be manifest plainly to all mankind, and the more it is shared the more it is enjoyed.

Fourth Sunday in Lent

When Need Cries Out To Christ

By The Reverend R. Leonard Small, D.D., Edinburgh

'He sought to see Jesus'.—Lk 19^3.

It is sometimes unfortunate that the chapter division of the Authorized Version, not infrequently rather arbitrary and artificial, interrupts the flow of the narrative, and obscures some helpful and suggestive impression. If one reads the New Testament reading suggested for this Fourth Sunday in Lent—Lk 18^{35}–19^{10}—ignoring, just for once, the break at the chapter ending, one finds two consecutive stories of exactly similar theme, two kindred incidents placed side by side by the Evangelist. Both the similarities and the differences are significant and, studied together, the two stories have much to tell of the ways in which men come to Christ, and how, personally and individually, He meets the need of each.

First, these two incidents emphasize *the willingness of Christ to turn aside at the call of need.* Repeatedly it is stated that Jesus was passing by or passing through. We know that He was on His way to Jerusalem, His face 'set like a flint' to go to Jerusalem. There is about His onward movement on this last journey the drive of a great

purpose from which nothing can turn Him back, and no power may turn Him aside. Yet He stops to listen to the pleading and to deal with the need of the blind man, while in the other case He turns aside to stay with Zacchaeus, apparently adapting His plans, for the chapter begins by stating that He ' entered and passed through Jericho '. How revealing and reassuring this is ! Here is Jesus with the Cross clear before Him, and the hard road of His chosen destiny beneath His feet, all the tides of the great world's anguish about to be forced through the channel of a single heart, yet He can spare time for the cry of one blind man's longing for sight. He notices the need that cries unspoken from Zacchaeus perched up there in the sycomore, as if Zacchaeus, almost without noticing it, were sending out a radio call for help. A minister in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland many years ago told how he had been rebuked for his lack of just this quality of concern. He had stopped on the street to talk to a lady and while paying all his attention, politely, to the lady herself, he was vaguely aware of her little son, hovering on the fringes, as it were, of this interview which did not include him. Suddenly he felt a strong, insistent tug at his coat-tails, and as he looked down heard a small reproachful voice say : ' Please, Mr. Weir, this is me '. That story has no parallel in the life of Him who stopped at the cry of the blind man, and turned aside in response to the unspoken appeal of Zacchaeus. Here is the Master who has time for every one.

It is helpful, further, to notice in both these incidents *the quality of persistence shown by each of these two men* in his desire to get to Jesus. The blind man, hearing the unwonted stir and bustle near the gate of Jericho. where, no doubt, he had his regular ' stance ' for begging, inquired of the by-standers what it was all about. He was told that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. Immediately he became highly excited and began to make a scene crying out to Jesus, knowing that here was a chance that might never come again. Those near him, possibly even some of the disciples, rebuked him and tried to silence him. Were they, perhaps, the same men who ' rebuked ' the mothers who brought their children to Jesus ? Were they trying, out of the goodness of their hearts, to protect Him, even from His own goodness of heart, and to prevent a scene that might upset Him ? The only result was that the blind man became more desperate and determined, refusing to be put off. Zacchaeus seems to have been quite different. He was moved, it would appear, by no more than an interested curiosity to see for himself that Jesus of whom he must have heard, much as an overseas visitor might take up a position of vantage at a street corner, hearing the Queen was due to pass by, and wishing to see for herself the Queen she had pictured so often. Perhaps, short of stature as he was, the glimpse he caught through the crowd made him long for more. Suddenly nothing mattered so much to him as to get nearer to Jesus. His position, his dignity, his clothes, his reputation were forgotten, and he scrambled like any schoolboy into the tree, to perch there precariously, and find himself involved in an adventure that transformed his life. He, too, refused to be put off, and Jesus seems to have been peculiarly responsive to that quality of persistent faith, that eagerness to get to Him. In the same way He was impressed by and responded to the persistence of the four men who refused to be put off by the crowd around the door, somehow manoeuvred their sick friend up the stairs and let him down through the roof. Is it not just here that too many fail in their efforts to get to Christ, to pass from hearsay to personal experience ? How many, like the blind man, have a need that He alone can meet, yet they let themselves be too easily put off by doubt and difficulties, or by obstacles others put in their way ? How many start like Zacchaeus with no more than an interested curiosity, and then find themselves searching wistfully, and ever more eagerly but get no further, because ' that kind of thing isn't done ' in the set in which they move, or they are worried about what people would say if they ' took up religion ' ? So, at some moving moment in their lives Christ passes by, and they let Him pass.

Most interesting and significant of all is *the way in which Jesus deals differently with each of these two men,* according to his mood. The blind man is led by the hand to Him, declares his desperate need, has his faith confirmed and rewarded, and is immediately cured. Zacchaeus is summoned to receive a self-invited guest, joyfully welcomes Jesus to his home, and then in the company of Jesus at last discovers for himself his real need, and, in a quite different way is cured and ' saved '. On any reading of the situation Jesus spends much more time on Zacchaeus than on the blind man. Is this fair ? Surely the answer is that Jesus gives to each man the time and attention which his need requires, and men's needs differ greatly. These two stories thus told together by Luke are a warning against trying to stereotype religious experience. We must make room and provide opportunity both for the blind man's sudden seeing of the light and the slower dawning that came to Zacchaeus. When the rock plug in the Atlantic, famous in weather-forecasts as Rockall, was annexed to Britain as a precautionary measure in relation to rocket sites in the Hebrides, a landing was made by helicopter from a naval vessel. But that was not the first time men had stood on this

inaccessible rock. Landings had been made by boat by men who waited for the right conditions of tide, sea, and swell, who sailed round and round the rock in a small boat watching for the one ledge on which a landing might be possible, then edging carefully in and jumping on to that ledge at the precise fleeting moment when conditions were right. So it is with Christ's coming to individual men. From one point of view each man must watch for the precise moment when Jesus is passing by, and seize his chance as did the blind man and Zacchaeus. From the other point of view it is also always true that Christ is constantly persistently seeking for one point at which He can 'land' on each man's life, waiting for the exact moment when He can come home to each man's heart. When and where these two processes coalesce He never merely passes by, He still stops and turns aside because need has cried out, and He has heard and answered.

PASSION SUNDAY

The Darkness of Doubt

BY PRINCIPAL J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., THE BAPTIST COLLEGE, CARDIFF

'Hath God forgotten to be gracious? hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies? And I said, This is my infirmity: but I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High'.—Ps 77^{9-10}.

If your spiritual skies are always blue and your vision of God always clear, this sermon isn't for you. But if sometimes you begin to wonder whether God really cares; whether this business of religion is worth-while; whether prayer means anything after all—then read on. There is a remedy. It's a remedy from this Book which was given for the healing of the nations.

1. Next time this mood is upon us, let us remember that this spiritual ailment is not something peculiar to ourselves, but *that we are part of a very goodly company*.

It is one of the devices of the devil to make a man feel that his case is unique and that no one has been quite in the position he is in now. It is a lie. And a wicked lie. For it causes him to think that he stands alone when actually he is in company with some of the best souls of the earth. How many times have we visited sick folk in their homes and found them feeling terribly sorry for themselves. No one has felt quite as they do! Then they are removed to hospital and a complete transformation takes place. The pain may still be there, but the panic is gone. Their condition is no longer something peculiar to themselves. They see it as part of a greater suffering shared by so many and handled by master physicians and surgeons almost as a matter of course.

That is true of the doubt and depression that sometimes attack even the children of faith. What a help it would be if only we remembered that some of the truly great souls have been in precisely that position.

This Psalmist, for instance. Listen to the triumphant song of faith in this very group: 'Sing aloud unto God our strength: make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltery. Blow up the trumpet . . .'. This is the call of a man who has learnt to scale the heights. But listen to him in this context: 'Will the Lord cast off for ever? . . . Does his promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies?' The same man? Quite likely the very same. At one moment he climbs the hills; the next he grovels in the dust. At one time ascending into heaven; at another he makes his bed in hell. And the Psalmist was a great soul.

Then there was John the Baptist. No greater was ever born of woman, according to the testimony of our Lord. A man of great faith was John, and of keen spiritual discernment. He was the first ever to recognize Jesus as Messiah. Before our Lord had entered on His public ministry, John pointed to Him and declared: 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!' Turn the pages again. John is in prison. Not a pleasant place to be in, it is true. But he does an incredible thing, even for a prophet in prison. He sends a deputation to Jesus with an inquiry. Remember he is the man who first proclaimed the Messiahship of Jesus. It comes as something of a shock to hear him ask Jesus: 'Art thou he that should come? Or look we for another?' Is it possible for a man of such insight to be so befogged? Can one of such great faith be so in doubt?

When next our spirit is cast down let us remember that our case is not unique. Some of the choice souls of the earth have felt just as we do.

2. The next thing to do is to recognize the fact that this is not a normal state of affairs. It so happens that *we have struck a bad patch*. That is what the Psalmist did here. He took himself in hand and said, 'This is my human frailty. This condition of mine is not the gauge of reality. It is a state of affairs that will soon pass.' And remembering this proved to be his salvation.

The recent reopening of the City Temple in London has set many of the older folk recounting stories about Joseph Parker, undoubtedly its most tempestuous minister. It is said of him that one Sunday evening he returned from service having had a violent quarrel with his church officers. He flopped into his chair and commanded his wife imperiously to get him pen and ink that he might

write out his resignation forthwith. She returned with a cup of coffee. Now, Mrs. Parker had learnt a valuable secret; the secret of distinguishing between the normal and the abnormal in human moods. She knew that in this particular frame of mind her distinguished husband was not capable of knowing himself or the world about him. It was a bad patch from which he would emerge. And the view of this which he held in such a mood was not what the real Joseph Parker would call sane. She had learnt to say in his stead, 'This is his infirmity. He will soon get over it.'

'This infirmity', said the Psalmist when he began to doubt whether God takes any notice and whether the religious life leads to a dead end. At such a time, will we not learn to say the same?

3. Finally, and best of all, in these times of doubt we need to *recall and concentrate upon the certainty that God once gave us.* 'This is my infirmity', says the Psalmist, 'but I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High.' He recalls a time when God's power was manifest beyond all doubt. And he has to make a choice. Which of these two states is the index to truth—the state in which faith is at a low ebb, or that time when he saw God so clearly that there was no possibility of doubting Him?

Every child of God has to make this choice. There are things which cause him to doubt; unaccountable tragedies in his own life and in the world around. But he has also his 'years of the right hand of the most High'. He has that certainty of God which was brought to him in Jesus Christ. When he comes down on the side of faith, he is not closing his eyes to the evidence. For the revelation of Jesus Christ is as much a piece of data in the universe he has to assess as is an earthquake or a tapeworm. And the man of faith claims that Christ is more significant than these dark things. He is the great 'year of the right hand of God' to which he looks.

This, then, is the Scriptural remedy for this gnawing malady of doubt and depression. He who takes it is no longer at the mercy of his moods. It can be said of him, as Bunyan said of his pilgrim, long ago,

> One here will constant be
> Come wind, come weather.

PALM SUNDAY

Readiness is All

BY THE REVEREND H. A. HAMILTON, B.A., BRIGHTON

Whenever we see a man, composed and controlled in a time of danger, we are moved to admire. When we see a woman facing an ordeal without fret or fuss, we want to know her source of strength. But when we see a man or woman unmoved by fury or unafraid of death, we know we are looking at the secret all desire to share. How can we live in a world of conflict and uncertainty so as not to be at the mercy of events but to have a sense of victory? To that question Palm Sunday has the answer. It holds the secret of what Jesus did for us men—and it shows us the source of freedom from fear.

Clearly this was a prepared, deliberate act; the act of a man who knew where He was going. Looking back over the days before, we can see Jesus coming to the complete readiness of will which made it possible for Him to walk firmly and fearlessly to His destiny. He had already accepted its inevitability; He had talked of it openly with His band of young men—talked as One who had faced already what would be asked of Him.

As folk will, who love a friend in danger, they resisted—tried to shield Him—even to restrain Him. They were not ready for what they were involved in, in their loving of Him. Which of us is? And that was the source of their confusion and betrayal in the moment of crisis. But for Him, the choice was made and the consequences received in advance. So He was able to set His face steadfastly toward the final scenes. And so—'they were amazed' as they saw Him. Do you see a grim grave Jesus walking in lonely determination? That would not have been amazing. What must have been astonishing was to see Him striding calmly and confidently, with no taut mouth and strained eyes—a man whose Cross was already behind Him, even if His crucifixion lay ahead.

This is the Jesus who makes His entry into Jerusalem—a man quite free from fear. His calm is deeper than any noise can disturb; His peace is too sure for men's anger to destroy. There is almost a carefree confidence about His actions, as of a man who already knows what the consequences may be and is undisturbed. He walks into the noisy bazaar in the Temple courtyard and, not defiantly, but of right throws out the rogues who were exploiting people who had come to pray. (Are they not still lurking in sacred places!) Daily He stands Himself in the Temple and, heedless of mounting anger, makes His challenge. Or, if you can overhear the conversations of the days of this week, do you not hear a ringing certainty in His speaking? Never does He seem to have been so swift in His replies, nor did His words ever have a sharper cutting edge. He exposes sham questions; confutes clever men. It might not be amiss to say He is 'in tremendous form'; and all this with almost certain death waiting to cut Him down any day. Only a man who had already won His victory could know such freedom!

It is the same when events overtake Him. In the Garden we see Him taking one last deep draught of the Cup, accepting at the cost of not less than everything the destiny of suffering. Then look again ; how cool He is in the fracas of His arrest ; how quietly He stands before His accusers ; how silent before Pilate. Is it not a picture of a man to whom all that is happening has already happened ? It does not disturb Him any more as men play out their little parts and say their exasperated words. Even when they bruise His body and tear His flesh, it is happening *to* Him. He is allowing it in His mind ; suffering it to be so. What He has accepted is working itself out. Can you begin to think what a spiritual victory must have happened ! Is it not even clear that this is how He bore the Cross, as One who, even as the nails were driven into His hands, was, in spirit, allowing it ? Out of what deep detachment of spirit could it have been possible for Him to say ' Father, forgive them ; for they know not what they do ' ? We can only bow our heads in amazement.

Is this not the miracle of our salvation ; not that there were stripes and wounds and the shedding of blood, but that in spirit Jesus was willing for it to be so, invincibly ? This at least is the Jesus whose victory was declared on this Palm Sunday journey. The events that were to happen to Him were already accepted in the inner man where He was at one with the Father. The details of how, when and where, had ceased to be of any consequence. The ingenuity of the powers of this world could be left to work them out. For Himself, He was ready ; He had made perfect His will.

Now this is the victory we are asked to contemplate to-day and in which, incredibly, we are asked to share. It is a deep we can never plumb but which will bear us up. We have no plumb-lines long enough ; yet the lesser deeps we have learned to measure give us some soundings. Have you ever seen a man calmly bearing himself in the midst of dangers—not recklessly, but as one who had accepted the chance of death ? I have looked on such and been amazed. I have seen an innocent man standing his trial, while those about him were making much ado ; and I have felt the strength there is in an invisible spirit that the words of men cannot hurt. I have seen men and women facing the ordeal of an operation as those who are already gladly willing for what will be done to their bodies ; or people going to face the tyranny of little men who were enjoying their power to hurt, and going as those who had accepted it all before it began. Whenever you see this inner victory over events, you know it has been won in advance. You see the dramatic act ; you do not see the inward preparation.

So we see Good Friday, and we say ' Did e'er such love and sorrow meet ? ' But we do not see the immeasurable wonder of it unless we see Palm Sunday as the day when the victory was already won. There is, I believe, a necessary three-fold rhythm about this supreme act of Christ : the day of readiness, the day of suffering, the day of fulfilment. This is the total victory and in it we are bidden to share in the whole of it. Not in the triumph of Easter unless we share the fellowship of suffering ; and not in Good Friday, unless we share the discipline of making ready our wills.

This day says to us each, and says to our world, that the secret of victory is to be so ready to act or to suffer that nothing can surprise us, nothing daunt us, or, in the end, nothing finally hurt us. Don't you long for that freedom ? Freedom from anxiety about *what* is going to happen ; about *how* it will happen, what it will feel like, or whatever you will find to say ; freedom from anxiety about *when* it will happen. All such anxiety paralyses us—and when things do happen we are found unprepared. It is out of such fear that we fall into the folly of making our petty plans, our patterns of what we would like to happen and when and where. How hard we try to impose those patterns on life and how loudly we have to insist that things are what we say they are.

It is from all such fears, such unreadiness of spirit, that the Jesus who went up to Jerusalem can set us free.

Recent Foreign Theology

Bultmann Festschrift. A second edition of the Festschrift celebrating the seventieth birthday of Rudolf Bultmann in 1954 has been issued.[1] It contains twenty-six essays by scholars from eight countries, seven in English, two in French, and the rest in German. The volume is divided into four sections, dealing with method in New Testament study, the background of the New Testament, the Gospels, and the Acts and Epistles. The British contributors were the late T. W. Manson and G. D. Kilpatrick, the former contributing a short paper on ' Preaching and Exegesis ', raising the question of the relation between the scientific study of the Scriptures and the homiletic tradition

[1] *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* [2nd ed., 1957]. Töpelmann, Berlin ; DM. 30.

of the Church, largely based on a sermon by F. W. Robertson of Brighton, and the latter writing on ὀρθοποδοῦσιν in Gal 2[14]. To traverse all the articles is impossible here, and a few must be singled out for mention. O. Cullmann has an important article on the Qumran texts and the Pseudoclementines, and H. Clavier a valuable historical and linguistic study of Πέτρος καὶ πέτρα. Amos Wilder writes on 'Biblical Hermeneutic and American Scholarship', noting the modified reaction against liberalism in America, and the empiricism of the American outlook. One of the longer articles is that by W. Eltester on 'God and Nature in the Areopagus Speech'. A much shorter one is Joachim Jeremias's on 'The Missionary Task in Mixed Marriages'. Throughout the volume a very varied menu is provided, from which every reader will find stimulating food for thought.

The German Church Conflict under Hitler. A little study which may be valued by the future student of German Church History comes from the pen of Professor Baumgärtel, who seeks to expose some aspects of the 'legend' which he says has grown around the conflict of the 1930's.[1] He criticizes a 1956 book by Wilhelm Niemöller, and says that it presents a partial picture of the facts. Amongst other things he observes that a telegram sent to Hitler in 1933 by Wilhelm's brother, Martin Niemöller, greeting Hitler in the name of more than two thousand and five hundred German pastors, who did not belong to the 'German Christian' group, should have been printed. He also attacks Karl Barth for what he describes as a misrepresentation of the situation in the German Theological Faculties under the Third Reich. There is a reply to Professor Baumgärtel's strictures by Wilhelm Niemöller, and a rejoinder by Baumgärtel. When we are farther from the unhappy events of those years it may be easier to assess them, but this brief and well documented polemical work may contribute something to that assessment.

Old Testament Institutions. The distinguished Dominican scholar Father R. de Vaux has published the first volume of a study of *The Institutions of the Old Testament*.[2] This deals with nomadism and its survivals, family and civil institutions. All is written simply, with abundant references to the relevant Scripture passages, but without reference by name to modern scholars in the body of the book. There is a good bibliography at the end, which makes it clear that the author is a scholar, acquainted with all the scholarly discussions of the questions dealt with. Moreover, in the body of the work, there is frequent discussion of various views, where the more informed reader will readily be able to identify the authors of those views. The whole is a reliable summary, packed with information on a great variety of subjects, including not merely the many aspects of family life and the administration of the realm, but economic matters, the division of time, weights and measures. It is written by a scholar of the first water, yet the scholarship is unobtrusive and the work is suitable for wide circulation.

Protestant-Catholic Debate. The tone of the debate between Protestant and Catholic in our day is very different from that of earlier days, and there has been a considerable growth in mutual understanding. Roger Mehl has made a contribution to this debate from the Protestant side in a small monograph, which both reviews the growth in understanding and the changes which have come over the scene and affirms from the Protestant side the elements of Roman faith and practice which are unacceptable to Protestants.[3] He rejects the definition of the Church in terms of Apostolic Succession or of the priesthood, and turns instead to the effective preaching of the gospel. On the attitude to Scripture and Tradition he recognizes the new trends in Catholic Biblical study, which have brought Protestant and Catholic to rub shoulders in this field in full co-operation. He treats of the alleged primacy of Peter and its inheritance by the Pope, and denies that there was any such primacy in the sense alleged, or that it could be inherited in the manner supposed. On the question of faith and works, which figures so largely in the debates of the Reformation period, he recognizes that Catholics to-day can use almost Lutheran language about faith, but finds continuing underlying differences in the conception of the efficacy of works. In the field of Mariology he finds deep differences separating Protestant from Catholic, and traces the growth of the place of the Virgin Mary in Catholic faith, and predicts yet further development. Throughout the author writes with great learning, and shows much knowledge of Catholic writings, and his tone is one of courteous debate, rather than the bitter polemics of bygone days.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

---

[1] *Wider die Kirchenkampf-legenden* [1958]. Freimund Verlag, Neuendettelsau ; DM. 2.

[2] *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, I. [1958]. Les Editions du Cerf, Paris ; Fr. 990.

[3] *Du Catholicisme romain : Approche et Interprétation* (*Cahiers Théologiques*, No. 40) [1958]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris ; Swiss Fr. 4.50.

Entre Nous

The Plain Man's Prophet

There are certain teachers who leave an indelible mark on the Biblical scholarship of their day, and whose teaching afterwards becomes part of the communal possession of the Church. Such a man was Arthur Samuel Peake. Something of Peake emerges in *Arthur Samuel Peake : 1865–1929*, which is a volume of essays in commemoration and selections from his writings, edited by John T. Wilkinson (Epworth Press ; 21s. net).

By academic standards Peake was a great scholar. He was a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford ; he possessed honours degrees in Classical Moderations and in the School of Theology ; he was the Denyer and Johnson Scholar, and he won the prize for the Ellerton Essay ; he was elected to a Theological Fellowship at Merton ; and he was, first, lecturer at Mansfield College and, afterwards, professor at Manchester. But the great characteristic of Peake was that, scholar though he was, he was determined and dedicated to bring the results of scholarship to the layman. ' He believed that he had a vocation to mediate the fruits of scholarship to ordinary folk.' ' Peake felt himself called to the task of popularization. He did not disdain the function of the middleman.' 'He laboured incessantly to bring the fruits of scholarship into the homes of all who would receive it.'

In Mansfield he instituted a series of inaugural lectures which were intended for those who were interested in theology, but who were not theologians. He believed that ' the University sinks below the level of its privilege and duty unless it hears the call to share the gains of scholarship with those whose life runs in other grooves '. He whole-heartedly agreed with the remark of Harnack : ' The theologians of every country only half discharge their duties if they think it enough to treat the Gospel in the recondite language of learning, and bury it in scholarly folios '. Here was Peake's tremendous contribution ; and an account of his work is timely, for every generation needs its Peake.

It is not to be thought that Peake met with no opposition. In his disseminating the results of modern scholarship many regarded him as the devil's advocate. But that which disarmed so many of those who might have been his unappeasable opponents was his own obvious Christian faith. ' He knew the facts that modern study of the Bible had brought to light. He knew them and was frank and fearless in telling them, but he was also a simple and consistent believer in Jesus, and he let that be seen too ; therefore, men who could not always follow him were ready to trust him, and let him go his own way.' ' Suspicion dissolved before his passionate devotion to Christ.'

One of his greatest contributions was his services to union within the Methodist Church. He always proceeded on the principle that ' our first duty to those who are separated from us is not to refute but to understand them '. In one great speech he gave his list of loyalties—first, to Jesus Christ ; second, to the Church Catholic ; third, to Methodism ; fourth, to Primitive Methodism ; fifth, to his own local church. A spirit like that would solve the problems of church union almost overnight.

He was a prodigious worker. He loved to tell how he met Sir James Frazer, the author of ' The Golden Bough ', who said that he was now on holiday because he was working eight hours a day instead of the usual sixteen ! And he liked to tell of the American editor who wrote an article with his right hand, another article with his left hand, dictated a third article to his secretary, and then, in order that no part of him might remain inactive, rocked the cradle with his feet!

He had his limitations. As a lecturer he tended to expound so fully the views of others that he never really stated his own ; but that was due, not to timidity, but to a sense of fairness. His blind spot was mathematics ! A former Principal of Hartley Victoria College began his career as a Cambridge mathematician and turned later to Semitics. ' Peake was wont to refer to him as " a brand plucked from the burning ! " '

It was characteristic of the whole man that to the end of the day he remained a layman. Maybe the two loveliest stories about him have nothing to do with scholarship, but everything to do with the Christian grace that was in him. He gave a poor man some work in his garden. It then struck him that his regular gardener might pass and feel upset at seeing some one else working there ; so he instructed his secretary to write to the gardener explaining the situation. It is little wonder that men loved a man who found time for courtesies like that. The thing which moved him most deeply of all was a remark of the servant-maid in his house, a remark that he was never meant to overhear : ' Well, of course, Dr. Peake is a real Christian '.

This book recaptures something of the wideness of his scholarship and the graciousness of his personality, and we who did not know the man, but who value his works, are privileged so to meet him.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.